



GRACE JOURNAL


A PUBLICATION OF GRACE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Winona Lake, Indiana

WINTER 1964

Vol. 5

No. 1



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
LYRASIS members and Sloan Foundation

<http://www.archive.org/details/gracejournal1964513kent>

GRACE JOURNAL

A publication of Grace Theological Seminary

VOLUME 5

WINTER, 1964

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

THE SPIRIT OF COMPROMISE	Henry M. Morris	3
"ACCURSED FROM CHRIST"	Nickolas Kurtaneck	13
THE ATONEMENT AND HUMAN SACRIFICE	David R. Dilling	24
GENERAL REVIEW	Herman A. Hoyt	42
BOOK REVIEWS		44

GRACE JOURNAL is published three times each year (Winter, Spring, Fall) by Grace Theological Seminary, in cooperation with the Grace Seminary Alumni Association.

EDITORIAL POLICY: The editors of GRACE JOURNAL hold the historic Christian faith, and accept without reservation the inerrancy of Scripture and the premillennial view of eschatology. A more complete expression of their theological position may be found in the Statement of Faith of Grace Theological Seminary. The editors, however, do not necessarily endorse every opinion that may be expressed by individual writers in the JOURNAL.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$2.00 per calendar year; single copy, 75c.

ADDRESS: All subscriptions and review copies of books should be sent to GRACE JOURNAL, Box 397, Winona Lake, Indiana.

Copyright, 1964, by Grace Theological Seminary. All rights reserved.

EDITORIAL STAFF

HOMER A. KENT, JR.

Editor

JOHN C. WHITCOMB, JR.

Managing Editor

HERMAN A. HOYT

General Review Editor

S. HERBERT BESS

Book Review Editor

JAMES L. BOYER

E. WILLIAM MALE

KENNETH G. MOELLER

Business Committee

ALVA J. McCLAIN

HOMER A. KENT, SR.

PAUL R. FINK

Consulting Editors

THE SPIRIT OF COMPROMISE

HENRY M. MORRIS

Head of the Department of Civil Engineering
Virginia Polytechnic Institute

"How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow him:
but if Baal, then follow him" (I Kings 18:21).

The spirit of compromise that prevailed among the people of God in Elijah's time also manifested itself in the mid-nineteenth century, as Christians labored to accept both God and evolution, both the Bible and the ages of geology. This was not surprising, for in every age there has been conflict between God and the Devil and a corresponding tension between the world-system and the community of the saints, and always there have been those among the latter who seek to ease the tension by yielding up some of the distinctives of the Bible-founded separatism to which they were called. Neither is it surprising then that the same spirit of compromise is moving strongly today among erstwhile Bible-centered Christians.

This age-long conflict has always been basically the same, although it assumes many forms. On one side there is the omnipotent God, the Creator and Ruler of the universe. On the other stands a finite creature, who presumes to deny the primacy and sovereignty of God, sometimes explicitly and more often implicitly. The conflict sometimes centers around the doctrine of salvation, whether by grace or works, sometimes over the question of authority, whether the Word of God or the wisdom of men, sometimes over the goal of history, whether the kingdom of God or a humanistic utopia. It is always a question of priority: is the universe God-centered or man-centered? Is our approach to the study of any question to be based on the sovereignty of God and the authority of His revelation, or is it based on the autonomy of the human will and wisdom?

The idea of evolution did not, of course, originate with Darwin or with his predecessors of the Enlightenment. The revelation of fiat creation ex nihilo is essentially unique to the Hebrew-Christian Scriptures. Other traditions or philosophies of origins all visualize development of the world and its inhabitants out of pre-existent materials of some kind. Basically, all such cosmologies are evolutionary, always in opposition to the concept that the

This paper was presented at the joint meeting of the American Scientific Affiliation and the Evangelical Theological Society at Asbury College in Wilmore, Kentucky, on June 20, 1963. It has been slightly revised for Grace Journal.

eternally self-existent Creator in the beginning brought all things into instantaneous existence out of nothing.

Sometimes the Mosaic cosmogony of Genesis is said to have been written as an accommodation to the culture of the early Hebrews, who were too naive to have understood the idea of evolution. But this is patently absurd, since it would have been far more natural to the Hebrews or any other ancient people to think in terms of an evolutionary origin of things than in terms of special creation from nothing. Evolution is the natural way to explain the origin of things for those who do not know and acknowledge the true God of creation.

In fact, some kind of evolution is absolutely necessary for those who would reject God. Thus, the idea of an evolutionary origin must have had its first beginnings in the mind of Satan himself, as the only means by which he could rationalize his rebellion against God. The only evidence he had that he was actually a creature of God was the fact that God said so. If he rejected the Word of God, then he must assume that he, along with other beings in the universe and with the non-living components of the universe, and even God Himself, had somehow evolved by innate processes of an eternally-existing universe into their present state. Thus, God's rule may simply have been a coincidence of priority of time of evolution, and might be overcome by a well-planned and executed rebellion.

It is instructive to trace the history of this rebellion throughout human history, as recorded in the Bible. In its essentials it boils down to a conflict between those who worship and serve the Creator and those "who changed the truth of God into a lie and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator" (Rom. 1:25). It is a conflict between God-centered and creature-centered religion. Any sort of religion which denies the Creator the place of absolute primacy and sovereignty in the universe, which prescribes limits of His action or power or which seeks to judge His deeds or His Word at the bar of human reason, is fundamentally a system of evolution. The universe or some aspect or component of it is held to be the focus of ultimate Truth and the idea of God is accommodated, if at all, in some derivative place in the system. This framework appeals to creaturely pride and thus has a strong appeal to fallen men. Acknowledgment of God's absolute sovereignty and man's total depravity, on the other hand, requires complete submission of man's wisdom and will to that of God, and this humiliation is stubbornly resisted by human nature.

Whenever God has created a new thing in the earth, calling out a man or a group of men who are to receive and propagate His Word, Satan has bitterly opposed Him and sought to incite opposition to His Word and purposes. Usually, Satan has developed this opposition most effectively through a spirit of compromise on the part of God's people.

Mother Eve was led first to doubt the absolute reliability of God's Word ("Yea, hath God said . . .?") before she fell into overt disobedience. Cain was undoubtedly a religious man, bringing his offering to God, but he did not offer it "by faith," as did Abel (Heb. 11:4), and Abel's faith, as is true of all genuine faith (Rom. 10:17), must have been centered in the Word of God. The inescapable conclusion, therefore, is that Cain brought an offering according to the decision of his own will and wisdom rather than according to the Word of God, and thus he was assuming for himself the prerogative to correct and revise God's Word. He

did not reject God's command to bring the sacrifice, but he judged it more expedient and agreeable to bring one which indicated growth and beauty rather than a bloody sacrifice speaking of decay and death.

The antediluvians became so self-centered (note the blasphemous self-assertion of Lamech in Gen. 4:23, 24) and opposed to God (note Enoch's testimony concerning the "hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him" as recorded in Jude 15) that the only remedy was complete destruction of mankind and the earth itself by the Deluge. This was not only for the destruction of the descendants of Cain. The descendants of Seth had eventually compromised with the Cainitic culture to the extent that they were also destroyed and "Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the Ark" (Gen. 7:23).

And even then it wasn't long until men again began to reject the Word of the Lord and desired instead to "make us a name" (Gen. 11:4). Because men refused God's Word, therefore God then confused their words and they were scattered. From that day on, the history of the Gentile nations has been predominantly one of spiritual deterioration, as recorded in Rom. 1:18-32. "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things" (Rom. 1:22, 23).

And what is idolatry and paganism but evolutionary pantheism? The transcendent Creator is identified with His creation, so that he must be depicted in terms of men or beasts or other created objects. God is a fish, or a cow, or a superman, or the sun, or the elemental forces of nature. He is a part of, and limited by, the universe. He is rejected as omnipotent, sovereign Creator of all things.

In this morass of evolutionary paganism, God spoke to Abraham and called him out to a position of complete separation from the world-system, to establish a new people of God through whom the Word of God might be transmitted. By faith, Abraham believed and obeyed the Word of God. He did not submit the Word of God to his own reason or Chaldean education or to the wise men of Ur, but simply "went out, not knowing whither he went" (Heb. 11:8), because God had spoken.

But again the spirit of compromise plagued the heirs of Abraham. His nephew and companion, Lot, "pitched his tent toward Sodom" (Gen. 13:12), and though "vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked," continued to "dwell among them" (II Pet. 2:7, 8) until the Lord turned the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah into ashes. Ishmael, the first son of Abraham, turned from his father's position of separation to marry a woman of Egypt. Esau, the first son of Isaac, wed two women of the Hittites. The descendants of Ishmael and Esau have ever since been bitter enemies of the chosen people, Israel.

When God, through Moses, called His people out of Egypt, they complained and longed to turn back time and time again. Once they went so far as to fashion a calf of gold, and call it God, and Moses was forced to make a clear-cut separation of those who were "on the Lord's side," and those who would compromise with the paganism of Egypt (Ex. 32:26).

The period of the judges was characterized by cycles of revival, compromise and apostasy, repeated over and over again. The Israelites for a while would worship and serve the true God, then begin to compromise with the pagan systems of the Canaanite nations, and finally would embrace Baal and Ashtaroth.

Eventually, again through a desire to be more like the surrounding nations, the people of God demanded a human king, and God gave them their request. But the same old cycle of revival, compromise and apostasy continued to operate. The spirit of compromise is always the prelude to apostasy.

The men whom we honor today as the great heroes of faith, on the other hand, are invariably those who stood firm against compromise with the world system of their day, who endured ridicule, suffering and often martyrdom because of their strong faith in the integrity of the Word of God. One thinks of Daniel and his three friends, willing to go into the den of lions or the fiery furnace rather than compromise with the pagan religions of Babylon and Persia, --of Nehemiah, rejecting the proffered alliance with the people of the land when building the walls of Jerusalem, --of Elijah, Josiah, Jeremiah, David, and the other great men of God who firmly believed and acted upon the Word of God in the face of tremendous pressure to compromise and accommodate their stand to public opinion.

Then there are the Christian martyrs, from Stephen on to Wycliffe, and even to those who suffer for their faith today in Siberia, in Red China and other great citadels of modern science and progressivism. All have been men of virile faith in the Word of God, believing that God is able to say what He means and that He means what He says. Apostate or compromising Christians do not fit into this category. They "love the praise of men more than the praise of God" (Jn. 12:43). Like Demas, they "love this present world" (II Tim. 4:10). They would like their "faith... (to) stand in the wisdom of men" (II Cor. 2:5).

The Bible warns in clear terms against this spirit of compromise with the philosophies and systems of the world. It is made emphatically clear that there must always be conflict between the flesh and the Spirit, between the world-system and the believer, between God and the Devil. Only a sampling of the numerous Scriptural exhortations is necessary to demonstrate this.

Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" (I Cor. 1:20).

Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God (Jas. 1:4).

And be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God (Rom. 12:2).

Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light

with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? (II Cor. 6:14, 15).

And this I say, lest any man should beguile you with enticing words... Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ (Col. 2:4, 8).

O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so-called: Which some professing have erred concerning the faith (I Tim. 6:20, 21).

For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, ...having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away (II Tim. 3:1, 5).

...they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction. Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness (II Pet. 3:16, 17).

In view of such urgent admonitions and exhortations to the Christian believer (and similar warnings could be multiplied many times from other passages of Scripture), one should be extremely resistant to any spirit of compromise with any of the anti-Christian beliefs or practices of this world-system. And this should be true more than anywhere else in connection with the philosophy of evolution since, as has been pointed out above, this philosophy is really the foundation of the very rebellion of Satan himself, and of every evil system which he has devised since that time to oppose the sovereignty and grace of God in this universe.

Those who advocate a compromising approach to the world do so hoping that this will relieve somewhat the tension between the Christian sphere and that of the non-Christian, and thereby make it easier to win such people to Christ. But, as important and urgent as it is to seek to win men to Christ and the Gospel, it is more important and more urgent to honor God and His Word.

And besides, men are never really won to Christ through compromise, anyway. No one is genuinely saved who imposes certain conditions before he will accept Christ and His salvation. He must come as a helpless child and as a hopeless sinner, trusting fully in the sovereign God for mercy and forgiveness, simply on the basis of the atoning death of His Maker and Redeemer. Compromise has no place in such a transaction as this.

The only reason, therefore, why an evangelical Christian would seek a more intellectually palatable version of the Gospel is that of alleviating its offence. A Christian today can maintain an open and vocal belief in real Creation, in the Fall and Curse, in human depravity, in blood atonement, in salvation by sovereign grace alone and in the coming judgment, only at the cost of suffering ridicule and rejection, in greater or lesser degree, by the "intel-

lectual" world. To a Christian with intelligence and ability, as well as ambition, this is very difficult to accept, and often leads him, whether consciously or subconsciously, into a spirit of compromise. And this spirit, of course, has led to numerous and varied devices by which it was thought the Biblical revelation could be harmonized with modern science and philosophy. Basically, all such "harmonies" in one way or another represent accommodations to the theory of evolution, for this is the basis of all anti-theistic movements and teachings.

The only firm and proper ground on which a Christian should stand, however, is the sure foundation of the Word of God, inscripturated in the Bible. It is certain that no one can possibly know anything of the prehistoric past or of the eschatological future with any certainty unless these matters are revealed by God. Science can only speak with certainty on things which are now. Science can measure and correlate and evaluate present processes and phenomena, but has no way whatever of knowing that these have always been the same or that they always will be the same. The principle of uniformity, which assumes this, represents therefore not a scientific law, but rather an act of faith. But that faith is faith in the eternity of matter, in materialism, in evolution, rather than faith in God and creation and revelation. The decision between these two faiths is not a scientific decision, but a spiritual decision, and is therefore made on the basis of moral and spiritual considerations rather than scientific evidence.

If one is willing to recognize that truly reliable knowledge of these matters can come only from God and to accept by faith the proposition that God has revealed them to us in the Bible, then it becomes apparent to the eye of faith that the Biblical framework is wonderfully consistent and satisfying and that the date of empirical science and recorded history all fit perfectly into it. As the Scripture says: "Howbeit we speak wisdom...: yet not the wisdom of this world" (I Cor. 2:6).

This basic Biblical framework, as recorded in Scripture, is built around the following key facts of history: (1) a real and special creation of all things, ex nihilo, in six days, following which God stopped creating; (2) the introduction of rebellion, disharmony, decay and death into the world through man's Fall and God's Curse on the whole creation; (3) destruction and renovation of the antediluvian earth and its inhabitants at the time of the great Deluge; (4) the work of redemption, whereby God Himself became flesh to reconcile the world unto Himself, by His substitutionary death and justifying resurrection; (5) the consummation of God's purposes for the world when Christ returns, involving wrath and judgment for all who have rejected Him, and the creation of a new earth and heavens as the eternal dwelling place of the redeemed.

This basic framework of earth history is emphatically rejected, in every part, by both ancient and modern intellectualism. This rejection is, and must be, based squarely on the assumption of uniformity. The study of present processes could not possibly lead to a knowledge of the above facts of Biblical history, for the simple reason that none of them could possibly be accomplished through present processes.

The study of such present processes is really the only legitimate domain of science. The only processes which can be actually studied and scientifically evaluated are those which are

in operation now or which have been in operation within the historic past, as pointed out above. But philosophers have projected these processes into the past and future, on the basis of the premise of uniformity, and have called this projection evolutionary science. It is clearly only philosophy, or even a religion of sorts, rather than a true science, but the highly vocal advocates of this kind of extrapolation have succeeded in persuading many people that "science" indeed has disproved the Biblical framework of earth history.

This, of course, has in essence always been the position of the unbelieving world and so is only to be expected. But the tragedy is that many Christians, even conservative, evangelical Christians, are so intimidated by this pressure that they are willing to compromise the Biblical framework in order to relieve the tension with uniformitarian philosophers. This happened in wholesale fashion in Darwin's generation, and is being repeated in ours. And now, as then, and as has always been true, compromise is but the prelude to apostasy.

Because one compromise merely leads to another, and then to another, until there is finally nothing left to compromise, the Christian must finally go fully over to the position demanded all along by the uniformitarian.

For example, the materialist will insist that geological science has proved the earth to be millions or billions of years in age and therefore that the Biblical record of a creation of all things only a few thousand years ago is in error. The Christian apologist, not wishing to incur the ridicule of the geologists, decides to accept the geological ages as presented, but to insert them in a possible "gap" between the first two verses of Genesis. The original creation was, he suggests, destroyed by some kind of pre-Adamic cataclysm, and the creation narrative of Genesis really tells about a "re-creation" of the earth, with its animal and human inhabitants.¹

But this compromise does not satisfy the geologists. The geological ages, with their purported record of a billion years of gradual and progressive development of all kinds of animals on the earth, including man, simply cannot be so easily disposed of. There is no indication geologically of such a worldwide pre-Adamic cataclysm, for one thing, and furthermore the fossil record preserved in the rocks representing the geological ages is essentially composed of the same kinds of animals as the Genesis narrative describes. The fossil record of man himself is also a part of these supposed geological ages, so that this theory soon leads to some kind of "pre-Adamic man," who lived and died before Adam, even though the Scriptures make it plain (e.g., Rom. 5:12; 8:19-23) that death first came into the world as a result of Adam's sin.

¹It is recognized that many Christians have advocated the gap theory on exegetical grounds rather than as a conscious attempt to correlate Genesis with geology. However, it should be recognized that the theory was first put forth about 150 years ago with exactly this primary purpose. Also it should be recognized that the theory, if valid, must be defended on exegetical grounds only; it cannot legitimately be offered as a means of reconciling the Bible and the geological ages, for this it does not do.

So it must finally be conceded that the "gap" theory will not really work, geologically speaking, not to mention the many serious Scriptural difficulties it entails. Uniformitarians simply will not accept any such cataclysm and re-creation. Therefore, the evangelical will sooner or later agree that the geological ages must really be contemporaneous and equivalent to the account of creation and development of the earth and its inhabitants as outlined in the first chapter of Genesis. But, he says, we can interpret the "days" of creation to be "days of God," rather than literal days. Thus the six days of creation correspond to the geological ages, during which God was "creating" all things. There are certain admitted gaps in the fossil record, and these correspond to acts of creation; at other times, the created kinds were developing into their various families and genera. This concept we can call "progressive creation," and the Biblical exegesis employed we shall name the "day-age theory."

This seems at first thought to be a very satisfactory way out of the dilemma, but it soon appears that the geologists do not respond with much enthusiasm. They point out that there are so many conflicts and omissions in the Biblical order of events of creation, as compared with the accepted evolutionary order of development in the geological ages, that the Genesis record must still be rejected as far as any historical and scientific accuracy is concerned. And they have a disconcerting way of insisting that the first two chapters of Genesis even contradict themselves on the order of creative events. Furthermore, the account of Eve's creation out of Adam seems to make no sense at all from the perspective of the evolutionist. Many of them seem to have a better sense of exegetical propriety than do the harmonistical expositors, recognizing that any system of interpretation which insists on reading "age" for "day," in the absence of any real contextual justification, is merely "wresting the Scriptures" rather than true exegesis. As far as the fossil "gaps" are concerned, they refuse to acknowledge these as evidence of creative acts, but rather continue to hope that the gaps will be continually narrowed and finally closed with increasing knowledge of paleontology and evolutionary mechanisms. And so the "day-age theory" finally proves an inadequate compromise.

So the historical and scientific significance of the Genesis record must be abandoned. But the evangelical now insists that this really doesn't matter after all. The Bible is not a textbook of science, but is a textbook of religion and morals. It merely tells us the "fact" of creation, and science must discover the method and time in God's other book, the Book of Nature. The creation record in Genesis is not meant to be taken literally and historically, but is rich in theological truth, teaching man the wonderful fact of divine order and purpose in the universe. Further, there is a wealth of religious significance in the allegory of creation and the fall of man, even though the events themselves did not actually take place. What difference does it make, they say, to the great doctrines of salvation whether man was a special creation or not, or whether the Flood was universal, or whether Eve was really fashioned out of Adam's side. These are peripheral matters and do not affect our basic Christian beliefs one way or another.

Now surely this compromise ought to be fully satisfactory to the evolutionist. We have adopted fully the interpretive framework that he uses; we can now participate with him as full partners in his research into the mechanisms of evolution, into the evolutionary phylogenies of animals and man, into the investigations of the origin of life itself and the development of

the cosmos, and at the same time maintain our faith in the integrity of the Word of God and of the Christian Gospel!

But somehow the evolutionist remains stubbornly unsatisfied with our concessions. If evolution satisfactorily explains all things, he says, why do you insist on bringing religion into the picture? The order that appears in the universe is largely only a construct of our own minds, and anyway it can be explained by chance variation and natural selection; the idea of Design has no scientific utility and is quite unnecessary. As far as Purpose is concerned, there is certainly no evidence in the scientific data themselves, with all their indications of false starts, inversions, extinctions, blind alleys and other facts of evolutionary history, to suggest that any sort of divine Being has any control over, or interest in, the evolutionary process. As Julian Huxley, perhaps evolution's chief protagonist, says:

Darwinism removed the whole idea of God as the creator of organisms from the sphere of rational discussion... Darwin pointed out that no supernatural designer was needed; since natural selection could account for any known form of life, there was no room for a supernatural agency in its evolution... There was no sudden moment during evolutionary history when 'spirit' was instilled into life, any more than there was a single moment when it was instilled into you... I think we can dismiss entirely all idea of a supernatural overriding mind being responsible for the evolutionary process.²

And when it is further realized that the writers of the Bible all seemed plainly to accept the Genesis account of creation as literally and factually true, as well as the Fall, the universal Flood, and the other great non-uniformitarian events of Biblical history, there is finally no recourse from regarding all the writers of Scripture as subject to cultural limitations and human error in what they wrote. Thus, even Jesus Himself, who frequently referred to and obviously believed in these events recorded in Genesis, must have been fallible in His judgment and limited in His knowledge.

Still further compromise would be necessary if we are to please the real leaders of evolutionary thought, such as Huxley, but we have already gone so far that there is nothing of Biblical Christianity left but a hollow shell. Compromise is a one-way street, ending in a precipice. Its only logical and normal outcome is utter apostasy from the Christian faith, and this is the road that has already been traveled by great numbers of Christian schools, churches, organizations, and publications in this post-Darwin century.

And it is all so tragically unnecessary! The Biblical revelation of origins is wonderfully satisfying, fully self-consistent, and perfectly harmonious with the character and purposes of a sovereign, gracious God. There can never be anything in true science (which really deals only with the present) which can ever impugn its literal, historical, factuality. May God in these last days guard His people against this Spirit of Compromise which is today threatening

²In Issues in Evolution, Sol Tax, ed. (University of Chicago Press, 1960), p. 43.

to remove the last vestige of Biblical Christianity even from supposedly Christian America.

The Lord Jesus, looking forward to the time of His return, and seeing the characteristics of the last days, was moved to pose the question: "Nevertheless, when the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth?" Perhaps this was meant as a direct question to those who would be professing a faith in Him and His words in those last days. May God grant His people the courage to answer His question: "Amen, Even so, come Lord Jesus."

"ACCURSED FROM CHRIST"

A Critical Monograph on Romans 9:3

Abridged by the Author

NICKOLAS KURTANECK

Professor of Bible, Biola College

It is revealed in Luke 19:10 that "the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost," and in II Peter 3:9 that the Lord is "not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." Since it is supported by Scripture it is thus without dispute that Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of man, was and is deeply concerned for the salvation of man. Because this is true of Him who was God manifest in flesh (I Tim. 3:16), who is the Head of the Body, His Church (Eph. 1:22-23), and the sole possessor of the redeemed (I Cor. 6:19-20), it should be equally true of every child of God and especially true of every one who has been called to preach and teach the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Every servant of Christ should manifest compassion and genuine love for the lost resulting in a constraining zeal for their salvation. This passion, however, be it ever so noble, must never increase to such an extent that it eclipses one's love for Jesus Christ. First and foremost in the believer's love should be a consistent and effective demonstration of true love for the Master, which should never stand in jeopardy of being relegated to a lesser position by a greater love for lost souls. The Redeemer must be loved preeminently, above and beyond every other person and objective in this life and that which is to come. This fact is interwoven into the heart and thrust of the first and great commandment enunciated by the Lord Jesus Christ, "...Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind" (Matt. 22:37).

In the light of this truth the declaration of Paul in Romans 9:3, "For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh," has been highly controversial, lending itself to various interpretations. Such is true because the obvious implication of Paul's statement, as translated in most English Versions, and as explained by many eminent scholars, would lead one to the logical conclusion that Paul's love for Israel exceeded his love for Jesus Christ.

Upon serious reflection of the eternal consequences interlaced in this conclusion, and knowing that Paul's epistles are characterized by sound logic and moral thinking, and that Jesus Christ was the center and circumference of his life (Phil. 1:21), the vexing question gripped my mind, did Paul really make such a wish as a Christian? The answer to this perplexing question challenged me to engage in a critical study of this text to try to determine its true meaning. The following is an abbreviated presentation of the result of my study.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

A brief historical sketch of the relationship between Paul and Israel at the time of the writing of the Epistle to the Romans will lay the foundation for the interpretation of the prob-

lem text. Prior to his informative discussion on the present and future position of Israel in the plan of God in chapters nine through eleven, the Apostle presented a masterful treatise on the basic doctrines of the Christian faith in the first eight chapters of Romans. Commencing with a brilliant treatment of universal sin and condemnation (1:18-3:20), he advanced skillfully through the doctrines of justification (3:21-5:21), sanctification (6:1-7:25), and eternal security (8:1-39), concluding joyfully and confidently "that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (8:38, 39).

It was at this moment, during the height of intense elation, while enthralled by the fact of the believer's security in Christ, that the Holy Spirit brought the lost condition of Israel to the forefront of Paul's consciousness. With this truth impressed vividly and forcefully upon his mind, Paul's experience of exultation was penetrated sharply by the existing pangs of deep concern and sorrow for his kinsmen. Were it not for this divinely-timed interruption,

Paul might have appropriately closed this doctrinal part of his epistle. But, meanwhile, the song of triumph with which he terminated that discussion, has awakened powerfully his feelings for his own nation, for whom all glory in Jesus Christ had more immediately been promised and designed.¹

One should observe further that the emotional vicissitude of Paul was undoubtedly precipitated by his anticipation of the hostile reaction of the Jews to the disclosure of the theological discourse in 2:17-5:21. The acute relationship already existing between Paul and Israel would be greatly intensified by virtue of his uncompromising declaration of the guilt and condemnation of the Jew and Gentile before God; the impotency of the religious advantages of the Jews to save; and the fact that justification is bestowed divinely as a free gift, uniquely by the grace of God, excluding all human effort, solely by personal faith in the propitiation of the Lord Jesus Christ. Such impartial doctrines were certain to enlarge the breach between Paul and Israel, and increase the anathemas hurled against him since his conversion to Christ. He would probably be accused of favoring the Gentiles, being indifferent to the Jews, and abandoning the divine promises made to Israel in the Old Testament.

It was thus under the stress of this tense situation that Paul was led by the Holy Spirit to pen chapters nine through eleven. Since the subject matter about to be discussed was above all others the most painful and offensive to his Jewish brethren, he approaches it with the greatest caution. The Apostle begins with a very solemn asseveration, appealing to his position in Christ, to verify his sincerity in what is about to be said. It is within this emotional framework that Paul's controversial statement is found, "For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh."

The writer agrees with the observation that "few passages in the New Testament have puzzled critics and commentators more than this."² It has proved to be a snag in the thinking of many able expositors. Varied interpretations, therefore, have resulted in an attempt to unravel its correct meaning and intent. The different viewpoints, in the main, have evolved from the manner in which scholars have handled the imperfect indicative verb εὐχομῆν, meaning "wish," and the connotation ascribed to anathema, translated "accursed." The fol-

lowing section presents the diverse interpretations with a brief refutation of those judged inadequate.

VARIOUS INTERPRETATIONS

Accursed from Christ at Time of Writing These Words

Proponents of this viewpoint believe that Paul actually wished to be eternally separated (anathema) from Christ if it would procure the salvation of his kinsmen. They maintain that he made this wish, while under the pressure of deep distress of soul, to prove his great love for Israel. Many endorsers of this interpretation are ambiguous in their presentation, but John Calvin, the renowned reformer, who subscribes to it, writes clearly:

He (that is, Paul) could not have expressed a greater ardour of love than by what he testifies here; for that is surely perfect love which refuses not to die for the salvation of a friend. But there is another word added, anathema, which proves that he speaks not only of temporal but of eternal death; and he explains its meaning when he says, from Christ, for it signifies a separation. And what is to be separated from Christ, but to be excluded from the hope of salvation? It was then a proof of the most ardent love, that Paul hesitated not to wish for himself that condemnation which he saw impending over the Jews, in order that he might deliver them.³

Some of the others who adhere to this view are Olshausen,⁴ Dodd,⁵ Linn,⁶ Brown,⁷ and Livermore.⁸

There are several valid objections to this interpretation. First, it ignores the basic meaning of the imperfect indicative verb, which is not, "I wish" or "I could wish," but simply, "I was wishing." Second, to affirm, as does Calvin, that it is no objection to this interpretation that Paul "knew that his salvation was based on the election of God, which could by no means fail; for as those ardent feelings hurry us on impetuously, so they see and regard nothing but the object in view,"⁹ does not mitigate the apparent theological incongruity imposed by it upon the thinking of Paul. It seems unlikely that Paul moved by a momentary emotional impulse would have just declared so confidently the fact of his security in Jesus Christ (3:38, 39). Third, adialeiptos, an adjective used in 9:2 to describe the intensity of Paul's grief, which means "unceasing or constant," argues against this viewpoint which says that Paul made his rash wish under the strain of an immediate emotional disturbance. For the verse translated literally, "That great sorrow and unceasing grief is in my heart," suggests that deep anguish of soul was the constant experience of Paul for Israel.

Violent Death in Behalf of Brethren

Softening the meaning of anathema, and translating the imperfect indicative verb "wish" as a present tense, the advocates of this viewpoint contend that Paul wished only to die a violent death if it could secure the salvation of Israel. After a lengthy discourse on the meaning of anathema based on the cognate word in the Old Testament in which he concludes that it does not mean eternal death, Albert Barnes, a defender of this interpretation, comments that

the Apostle evidently means to say that he would be willing to suffer the bitterest evils, to forego all pleasure, to endure any privation and toil, nay, to offer his life, so that he might be wholly devoted to sufferings, as an offering, if he might be the means of benefiting and saving the nation. This does not mean that Paul would be willing to be damned forever.¹⁰

This explanation is also held by Jerome,¹¹ Gill,¹² Clarke,¹³ and Scott,¹⁴ to name a few.

Apart from the failure of this viewpoint to render correctly the tense of the imperfect indicative verb, it is untenable by virtue of the connotation that it gives to anathema. This word derives its basic meaning from the Hebrew term kerem. A careful study of this word in the Old Testament, translated "devoted, cursed, accursed, destroyed, and consecrated," and rendered by the term anathema in the Septuagint, reveals that it is used to designate an object or person dedicated either to God or to destruction without the possibility of ever again being redeemed (cf. Lev. 27:28, 29; Deut. 7:26; Josh. 6:17-18; I Sam. 15:21; Mic. 4:13). Leading Hebrew lexicographers support this meaning as illustrated by William Gesenius who says that it speaks of consecration unto God "so that the person or thing thus devoted can never be redeemed, . . . to devote to destruction, to utterly destroy, to exterminate cities and their inhabitants."¹⁵

In the New Testament, beside our text, anathema is found in Acts 23:14, I Cor. 12:3; 16:22, and Gal. 1:8, 9. Little exegetical effort is required to demonstrate that it means eternal damnation in these cases. This was the obvious sense given to the word by the early Christian writers, and from them it passes into the use of the Church. "'Let him be anathema,' being the constant formula of pronouncing anyone, in the judgment of the church, exposed to divine malediction."¹⁶

To erase all doubt concerning the meaning of anathema in the problem text, Paul says, anathema apo tou Christou, translated, "anathema from the Christ." That this speaks of eternal separation from the Lord Jesus Christ should be clear to all, for as Calvin has remarked, "And what is to be separated from Christ, but to be excluded from the hope of salvation?"¹⁷

Excommunication from Church

Insisting that the doom of Israel was not to eternal damnation, but merely excommunication from the Church, the adherents of this interpretation affirm that Paul wished nothing more than to be excommunicated from the Church in the place of Israel. It is thus explained by Williams:

In order to know to what doom Paul would yield himself in the place of the Jews, we must first inquire to what doom they were themselves exposed; for it is this doom only that he would assume in their stead. It has been too rashly taken for granted that their condemnation was to eternal damnation; and that it was, therefore, eternal damnation to which Paul would devote himself in their stead. But this was not Paul's concept with regard to the unbelieving Jews. Paul never taught or conceived that the Jews, whether en masse or individually, were

doomed to be damned, on the ground of unfaith in the Messianic promises, or that even in their apostasy they were beyond the immediate reach and the ultimate saving power of the gospel. They were anathema from the Christ; they were en masse counted outside of the community, and individually out of communion with the Christian Church. When Paul thinks of anathema in connection with the Jews, the utmost that he has in his thought is, that the once elect people are now separated en masse from the Messiah, that is, from the Messianic Church of the fathers. He declares that to save them to the Church and to Christ, if so it could be, to devote himself to be excommunicated in their stead.¹⁸

Several other proponents of this view are Sumner,¹⁹ Valpy,²⁰ Henry,²¹ and Poole.²²

The fallacy of this position is quite apparent, and needs no lengthy refutation. In addition to the erroneous interpretation of the imperfect indicative verb, without any valid support from Holy Scripture, it makes anathema mean "excommunication," and "from the Christ" mean "from the Church." One need not be an expert in theology, or skilled in the art of exegesis, to disprove these renditions. For a mere perusal of Holy Writ will reveal that anathema never means "excommunication," and "from the Christ" cannot possibly mean "from the Church," since Christ is not the Church but the Head of the Church, which is His Body composed of born-again believers (I Cor. 12:12, 12; Eph. 1:21-23, 2:19-22). This viewpoint, which declares that Paul "never taught or conceived that the Jews, whether en masse or individually, were doomed to be damned, on the ground of unfaith in the Messianic promises,"²³ is, to say the least, laded with doctrinal aberrations.

A Conditional Statement

This is by far the most popular and common explanation, and is embraced by a large host of capable scholars. Believing that it was the intent of Paul to express his ardent love for Israel during the peak of an emotional crisis, and accepting the plain meaning of "anathema from Christ," and cognizant of the serious implications involved in the character of Paul's wish, the advocates of this interpretation say that the wish was hypothetical because he knew that it was wrong and could never be realized. Well known for his ability to expound the Word of God, a holder of this viewpoint, Charles Hodge writes that Paul does

not say that he did deliberately and actually entertain such a wish. The expression is evidently hypothetical and conditional, "I could wish were the thing allowable, possible or proper." So far from saying he actually desired to be thus separated from Christ, he impliedly says the very reverse. "I could wish it, were it not wrong; or, did it not involve my being unholy as well as miserable, but as such is the case, the desire cannot be entertained." This is the proper force of the imperfect indicative when thus used; it implies the presence of a condition which is known to be impossible.²⁴

Other commentators who subscribe to this view are Alford,²⁵ Shedd,²⁶ Plumer,²⁷ Lenski,²⁸ Robinson,²⁹ Meyer,³⁰ Westcott,³¹ Godet,³² Stuart,³³ and many more.

The main objection to this interpretation is its arbitrary treatment of the imperfect indicative verb. Paul did not say, "I could wish if it were possible," but plainly, "I was wishing." Since there are standard constructions in the Greek to express a conditional wish (discussed in the writer's defense of his position), apart from the assumed purpose for Paul's wish (i.e. to prove his deep love for Israel), there is no valid argument for the imposition of the hypothetical character upon Εὐχομένη.

It should be observed further that it is highly improbable that such an unreal postulation as required by this view would have served its implied purpose. To say, as does Hodge,³⁴ that Paul did not really entertain such a wish because it could not be realized, and yet insist that he used this hypothetical means to impress upon the minds of his kinsmen his ardent love for them is to engage in circular reasoning that proves nothing in the end. Upon close examination it would seem that the assumed intent of this wish would be stripped of its relevance.

The illogic of such a conditional wish is seen in the following paraphrase. According to this viewpoint Paul is saying, "I desire to impress upon the minds of my Jewish brethren my great concern for their lost condition, and also my deep love for them. The greatest sacrifice, therefore, which I could make to prove my great love would be to wish myself accursed (eternally separated) from Christ if this would secure their salvation. Realizing, however, that such a wish could never be attained, I refrain from actually making it. Essentially, then, I am saying that I could wish to be separated eternally from Christ in behalf of my kinsmen to gain their salvation, but since this wish could never be fulfilled, I am not actually making such a wish."

We find it difficult to understand how Paul could have proved his point with the above circular reasoning. It appears that if it were Paul's purpose to prove his love for Israel that he would have wished for something which had at least a remote chance of being realized. Such a wish, as supposed by this interpretation, is no wish at all, and thus is devoid of meaning.

A Parenthetical Statement

The endorsers of this explanation rest their case heavily upon the primary sense of the imperfect indicative verb. It is their claim that Paul's wish is to be interpreted parenthetically; that it describes his own state prior to conversion, while separated (anathema) willfully from Christ; that it reflects the present condition of his countrymen, and explains the reason for his great concern and sorrow for them. After questioning the likelihood of Paul's making a wish that had no possible chance of being fulfilled as expounded by the Conditional view, Griffith Thomas submits the Parenthetical view as the best interpretation:

When we carefully look at the Greek text we feel inclined to doubt this familiar interpretation, for there is no "could" in the Greek, which is quite literally, "I used to wish," or "I was wishing." Let us read the words in this light. "I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart (for I myself used to pray to be accursed from the Messiah) for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh." When read thus, the words form a parenthesis, and give special point to his sorrow.³⁵

A few of the other adherents of this position are Kendrick,³⁶ Haldane,³⁷ Darby,³⁸ Mahan,³⁹ Ironside,⁴⁰ and Lange.⁴¹

WRITER'S INTERPRETATION OF THE TEXT

It is believed that a satisfactory treatment of this controversial text requires a careful examination of the areas of grammar, context, and logic. Considered together it is my opinion that the conclusions deduced from these lines of investigation present a strong case for the acceptance of the Parenthetical view, because it alone is in keeping with the basic function of the imperfect indicative tense of ēuchomēn, and thus clears the passage of any implied doctrinal and moral offense.

Argument from Grammar

Meaning of the imperfect tense.--Mention should be made that, apart from a minor variation found in manuscripts D (sixth century) and G (ninth century), there are no variant readings within the text which would alter or influence its interpretation. It reads, ēuchomēn gar anathema einai autos egō apo tou Christou, translated literally, "For I myself was wishing to be anathema from the Christ." Attention should also be called to the fact that the original manuscripts did not contain any punctuation marks; therefore, some freedom is permitted to the scholar to make changes in punctuation which are reasonable and restrained. The writer believes that Rom. 9:1-3, which lends itself to the Parenthetical view, is a case that warrants some changes.

In any endeavor to exegete Scripture it is standard procedure to accept the primary sense of a tense unless there are valid hermeneutical grounds for its rejection. Such a basis, in my judgment, does not exist for the dismissal of the regular usage of the imperfect tense used by Paul. A quick check of the recognized texts on Greek grammar will reveal that the "imperfect is used of action in progress in past time,"⁴² and this is manifestly the most characteristic use of the tense."⁴³ This action may be simultaneous, prolonged, descriptive, repeated, customary, interrupted, attempted, or begun, but always occurring in the past. The exact type of action happening in past time will be determined by the immediate context or related Scripture. In our text it is believed that Paul was using the imperfect tense to describe his own experience prior to conversion to Christ.

Means of expressing a conditional wish.--There are several ways by which Paul could have expressed a hypothetical wish if he so desired. In addition to the subjunctive mood, which is the mood of mild contingency assuming unreality, he could have used the optative mood. This is believed to be a step farther removed from reality than the subjunctive, and is the mood of strong condition that contains no definite hope of realization.⁴⁴ Furthermore, the use of ei with the indicative can be used to denote "that there is no hope of fulfillment, and an, a particle, can stand either "with the optative or indicative, and imparts to the verb a contingent meaning."⁴⁵

It is to be noted that the main words used to express a wish are euchomai and boulomai. Beside Romans 9:3, euchomai is found in Acts 27:29 in the imperfect indicative form, and in Acts 26:29 in the optative mood with the particle an. In the first case the imperfect indicative

verb is used to describe continuous action in the past, but the presence of an implied condition in the latter instance has called for the optative euxaimēn with the particle an. It is the wish of Paul before King Agrippa in which he said, "I would to God (that is, I would pray to God) that not only thou but all who hear me this day, were both almost and altogether such as I am, except these bonds."

The verb boulomai is used in Acts 25:22; 28:18, II Cor. 1:15, and Phil. 13 in the imperfect indicative form stressing action in the past, and is found once in the optative mood with ei in Acts 25:20. Since no conditions are involved in the wishes in the former cases, the imperfect indicative form is used; however, the presence of a strong condition in the latter case required the optative mood with ei. It is therefore maintained that a careful check of these texts will support the contention that ēuchomēn in Rom. 9:3 should be interpreted as denoting action in past time minus the hypothetical character.

The correct position of the intensive pronoun. --To some this might be considered a minor point, but, in my judgment, the proper position of the intensive pronoun autos in the translation of this verse does contribute to the defense of the Parenthetical view. The text reads thus: ēuchomēn gar anathema einai autos egō apo tou Christou. It is to be observed that autos appears in the nominative case, and is used with egō to emphasize the subject. This means then that it must be placed in the subject, and should be translated, "I myself was wishing to be accursed from Christ," and not as found in the King James Version, "I could wish myself to be accursed from Christ." Such a rendition of autos makes it appear as an object of the verb. A correct placing of this pronoun eliminates any implication that Paul was making the wish at the time of the writing of this text.

The meaning of adialeptos. --Since this adjective means "unceasing or constant" it implies that sorrow and grief for Israel had been in Paul's heart before penning this passage. This fact would argue against all views which insist that he made a sudden hypothetical wish under the immediate strain of a pronounced emotional crisis, and would tend to support the Parenthetical view which affirms that grief and sorrow for his kinsmen were always with Paul.

Argument from Context

In a very true sense the closing thoughts of Paul in chapter eight influenced his introduction in chapter nine, for the conclusion in chapter eight declares the wonderful truth that there is no separation from Christ for the believer. Evidently this fact shaped the leading thought in the opening of chapter nine because Paul was confronted immediately by the heartbreaking realization that his people were not able to share in his exultation and confidence since they were separated from Christ.

This separation was of their own choosing evolving from their rejection of Christ, which appears to be expressed in the wish of Paul, and this fact explains the imperfect indicative tense used by the Apostle. He reflects the true spiritual condition of his kinsmen at the time of writing by referring to his own former state of unbelief. What he himself wished in the past, while hurling blasphemies upon Christ and His followers as a bigoted Pharisee and devotee of the Mosaic Law, is in reality the present status of Israel. The sudden confrontation by this fact undoubtedly accentuated the already existing sorrow in Paul's heart for his Jewish brethren.

Since Paul was speaking of his own condition prior to conversion he rightfully used the imperfect tense, for it declared his experience of many years as going on in the past without stipulating the terminus. The ad quem of his state of anathema from Christ was unimportant, because his primary purpose in recalling it was merely to explain the presence of constant sorrow in his heart for Israel, which was brought forcefully to the forefront of his consciousness by the glorious truth that there is no separation from Christ for the redeemed. The terminus of his lost condition is revealed clearly in other passages of Scripture.

Argument from Logic

This line of evidence is presented to show the serious implications of the views which declare that Paul actually wished to be anathema from Christ, or that he expressed a hypothetical wish to be separated from Christ. It is maintained that these logical deductions contribute weight in support of the Parenthetical view.

1. Regardless of how men may argue that such a wish doesn't mean that Paul loved his kindred more than Christ, the obvious conclusion is that if he did entertain this wish then his love for Israel exceeded his love for Jesus Christ. To dismiss this objection by saying that he did not really make the wish since he spoke hypothetically does not remove the offense, for such implies that Paul would have wished to be separated from Christ were it possible. By all rules of sound logic this implies a greater love for his kinsmen than for Christ. It is indeed true that to

desire the curse of God would be to desire not only suffering, but moral alienation from Him, the withdrawal of the soul's capacity to love Him. Thus the wish would be in effect an act of greater love for our neighbor than for God.⁴⁶

2. Such a wish, whether expressed actually or hypothetically, must mean that Paul desired to exchange heaven for hell. Reflection upon the grave consequences interwoven into this fact causes one to shudder. In addition to eternal separation from the Lord Jesus Christ, whom Paul loved preeminently (Gal. 2:20; Phil. 1:21), it would mean separation from the other members of the Godhead, from all the redeemed; and the sufferings of everlasting torment, along with the destruction of his ability to love; and to experience moral and spiritual deterioration forever and ever. Surely sound logic constrains one to say that Paul could under no circumstances even suggest such a wish as a believer.

3. To make such a wish as a believer would be deliberate sin. Cowles has explained thus:

Bearing in mind that the context requires that "anathema from Christ," should be essentially separation from Christ; and also that the case of the unbelieving Jews must interpret and determine Paul's meaning in these words, we are compelled to say that this wish and prayer are a great sin. It certainly was sin as it lay in the hearts of the unbelieving Jews, cursing the name of Christ. It was a sin of the same sort as it lay in Paul's ungodly life, when he was compelling Christians to blaspheme; and this, it would seem, must be the sense of his words here. Still more revolting and insupportable will this appear, if we con-

sider that it is this very sin of his brethren which agonizes his heart at this moment so terribly. Is it possible, now, that in the same breath he can say, "I could wish for myself the same sin and the same doom, in behalf of my brethren."⁴⁷

4. The final consideration is doctrinal. Paul's writings contain many references to the doctrine of eternal security within the framework of divine election and predestination. To maintain, therefore, that Paul would deliberately propose even a hypothetical wish which opposed his revealed theology appears to be an attack against his theological consistency. That Paul loved deeply the Jewish people cannot be denied, but he loved the Lord Jesus Christ more. His deep concern for Israel can amount to no more than expressed in the words, "Brethren my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved" (Rom. 10:1).

ENGLISH PARAPHRASE

"I am speaking the truth in Christ, I do not lie, my conscience continues to bear me witness in the Holy Spirit, that great grief and constant sorrow is in my heart (for I was once wishing myself to be accursed from Christ) for my brethren my kinsmen according to the flesh."

DOCUMENTATION

1. H. Olshausen, Biblical Commentary on the New Testament (New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co., 1858), IV, pp. 69-70.
2. A. Clarke, Clarke's Commentary (New York: Abingdon-Codesbury Press, 1814), VI, p. 108.
3. J. Calvin, Commentary on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans (Grand Rapids: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1947), pp. 335, 336.
4. Olshausen, op. cit., pp. 84, 85.
5. C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932), p. 151.
6. O. T. Linn, Studies in the New Testament (Anderson, Ind: The Warner Press, 1943), II, 37.
7. D. Brown, Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Glasgow: William Collins, 1843), p. 97.
8. A. A. Livermore, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (Boston: Brosby Nichols & Co., 1854), p. 160.
9. Calvin, op. cit., pp. 335, 336.
10. A. Barnes, Notes on the Epistle to the Romans (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1851), p. 189.
11. H. Alford, The Greek Testament (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1894), II, 403.
12. J. Gill, An Exposition of the New Testament (London: William H. Collingridge, 1853), II, 74.
13. A. Clarke, op. cit., pp. 108, 109.
14. T. Scott, The Holy Bible, (Boston: Armstrong, Crocker & Brewster, 1831), V, 66.
15. W. Gesenius, Hebrew and English Lexicon (Boston: Crocker & Brewster, 1849, p. 345.
16. C. Hodge, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (Philadelphia: James S. Claxton, 1864), p. 466.

17. Calvin, op. cit., pp. 355, 336.
18. G. W. Williams, An Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans (Cincinnati: Jennings and Pye, 1902), pp. 286-289.
19. J. B. Sumner, A Practical Exposition of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans (London: J. Hatchard & Son, 1843), p. 179.
20. Valpy, New Testament (London: A.J. Valpy, 1836), II, 342, 243.
21. M. Henry, A Commentary on the Holy Bible (New York: Funk & Wagnalls), VI, 969.
22. M. Poole, Annotations upon the Holy Bible (New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1853), III, 509.
23. Williams, op. cit., pp. 286-289.
24. Hodge, op. cit., p. 468.
25. Alford, op. cit., p. 403.
26. W. G. T. Shedd, A Critical and Doctrinal Commentary Upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1893), pp. 273, 274.
27. W. S. Plumer, Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Romans (New York: Anson, D. F. Randolph & Co., 1871), pp. 456, 457.
28. R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Columbus: Lutheran Book Co., 1936), p. 587.
29. T. Robinson, A Suggestive Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1873), II, 4, 5.
30. H. A. W. Meyer, Critical & Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1889), p. 357.
31. B. F. Westcott, St. Paul and Justification (London: Macmillan and Co., 1913), p. 335.
32. F. Godet, Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892), II, 132, 135.
33. M. Stuart, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (New York: H. Griffin & Co., 1835), p. 401.
34. Hodge, op. cit., p. 468.
35. W.H.G. Thomas, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1947), p. 245.
36. Olshausen, op. cit., p. 85n.
37. R. Haldane, Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans (New York: Robert Carter, 1847), pp. 451, 452.
38. J. N. Darby, Synopsis of the Books of the Bible (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, IV, 196).
39. A. Mahan, Lectures on the Ninth of Romans (London: Ward & Co., 1850), pp. 25-28.
40. H. A. Ironside, Lectures on Romans (New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1928), p. 111.
41. J. P. Lange, A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), V, 296-306.
42. E. D. Burton, Syntax of the Mood and Tenses in New Testament Greek (Chicago: University Press of Chicago, 1897), p. 15.
43. H. E. Dana & J. R. Mantey, A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1946), p. 187.
44. Dana & Mantey, op. cit., p. 172.
45. Dana & Mantey, op. cit., pp. 246, 259-260.
46. H. C. G. Moule, The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1908), p. 163.
47. H. Cowles, The Longer Epistles of Paul (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1888), p. 111.

THE ATONEMENT AND HUMAN SACRIFICE

DAVID R. DILLING

Many trusting hearts have paused to ponder the weighty words of Genesis 22:2, "Take now thy son...and offer him for a burnt-offering." This text prompted Søren Kierkegaard to ask, "Is there such a thing as a teleological suspension of the ethical?" Most serious readers of Genesis 22 have doubtless shared the concern which promoted Kierkegaard's enquiry.

The problem with which we are here concerned regards the interpretation of the phrase, "And offer him there for a burnt-offering." Did this mean that Abraham was actually to kill and cremate his own son? If so, how can Yahweh (Jehovah) be justified for making such a command? Are not such sacrifices prohibited? Is not the very idea abhorrent, and does not the very suggestion offend our moral sensitivity? Or was Abraham merely commanded to wholly dedicate his son to Yahweh? In this case, why is the expression 'olah' used, and how can God be vindicated for allowing Abraham so grossly to misinterpret His will? In either case there is a theodicy--the problem of reconciling the divine command with the otherwise known divine nature and purpose.

There is, to be sure, an awesome aspect to the stern, succinct narrative regarding the sacrifice of Isaac. Unfortunately, many readers have been overawed. The present study is not slanted to the liberal theologian, but to the otherwise conservative interpreter who through his awe at the sacrifice of Isaac has prepared himself for major hermeneutical and Christological concessions.

The severity of Abraham's test and hence the significance of the problem of this study was greatly multiplied by the soteriological implications of his action. The promise of salvation and blessing was to come through Isaac. This was clear enough to Abraham. But if to him, how much more is that clear to us who have the full revelation concerning that seed through whom all nations will be blessed, even Jesus. The Divine Providence seems to delight in manifesting the glory and power of God in such incidents where the hope for the fulfillment of the Messianic promise hangs by the finest thread--and that about to be cut off. As in the day that Cain killed Abel; as in the day that Athaliah destroyed all the seed royal save Joash; as in the day that Haman devised his wicked plot against the kin of Mordecai; and as in the day that Herod sought the life of Messiah Himself; so it seemed on this occasion, Abraham was commanded not only to sacrifice his beloved son, "but to cut in pieces, or cast into the fire, the charter of his salvation, and to have nothing left for himself, but death and hell."¹

Two problems bearing on the sacrifice of Isaac demand attention before the nature of that sacrifice can rightly be evaluated. These are the relation of Abraham to the rite of human sacrifice and the attitude of Yahweh toward the same.

THE PRACTICE OF HUMAN SACRIFICE

The sacrifice of Isaac has traditionally been related in one way or another to the practice of human sacrifice. It is supposed that such sacrifices were prevalent in Abraham's day. It

is urged on the one hand that Abraham's offering was qualitatively identical to that of his pagan ancestors and neighbors. Others maintain that the experience of Abraham is unique, and should be compared only with the sacrificial death of Christ, to which it bears a typical relationship.

In the early stages of modern archaeological discovery, generalizations regarding practices such as human sacrifice were sometimes made with too great haste. Time has tempered the judgment of authorities, but the evidence that such sacrifices were actually carried out remains intact. In Mesopotamia, for example, we have the positive evidence of a published Babylonian cylinder seal which unmistakably portrays the actual execution of a human sacrifice.² A.H. Sayce, British Assyriologist of a generation ago, has called attention to an Akkadian poem of pre-Semitic times with its later Assyrian translation concerning the sacrifice of a firstborn son. It says distinctly, "His offspring for his life he gave."³ Biblical evidence that human sacrifice was known in Mesopotamia in later times is found in II Ki. 17:31, "...And the Sepharvites burnt their children in the fire to Adrammelech and Anammelech, the gods of Sepharvaim." Among the Canaanites, the silence of the Ugaritic texts with respect to human sacrifice⁴ has confirmed the opinion of Prof. Albright that human sacrifice, though well known, "does not seem to have been practiced quite so frequently as used to be thought."⁵ Among the Hebrews, it must be conceded that human sacrifice was never an established or recognized part of the Jewish religion. The sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter, for example, will admit of interpretation other than that of a true human sacrifice. Although rejecting the idea that human sacrifice was ever a legitimate or recognized element of the religion of Israel, it cannot be denied that the cult did exist as an idolatrous abomination in times of religious declension and national apostasy. Biblical references to such sacrifices uniformly relate them to the worship of the deity Molech.

We conclude therefore that Abraham probably had some knowledge and experience with human sacrifice. It appears, though, that such knowledge was more limited than was supposed in previous generations. On the other hand, we deny on the basis of Levitical legislation that Yahweh ever demanded human sacrifice as a general practice for the nation of Israel. Therefore, whatever else is said of God's demand upon Abraham, it must be acknowledged that his experience is unique in Old Testament history.⁶

YAHWEH AND HUMAN SACRIFICE

It is generally assumed that the Old Testament categorically prohibits the rite of human sacrifice. To be sure, the Mosaic Law contains certain prohibitions in this regard.⁷ However, a thorough examination of these prohibitions sheds significant light on the problem of the sacrifice of Isaac. For example, (1) The legal prohibitions, as well as the prophetic polemics,⁸ are uniformly related to heathen deities. In the passages cited, human sacrifice occurs almost incidentally amid lists of abominations rendered in connection with idolatrous worship. (2) The greater offense is not the sacrifice, but the idolatry involved in offering such a sacrifice to a god other than Yahweh. The first commandment is not, "Thou shalt not offer human sacrifices," but, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me."⁹ (3) The Bible contains no prohibitions of human sacrifice to Yahweh. The only possible exception to this principle is the legislation regarding the redemption of the first-born sons in Ex. 13:1-16. This passage, however, does not condemn human sacrifice. On the contrary, it proves that Yahweh had a very definite claim on all the first-born of Israel, whether man or beast.

The Grace of God in the Redemption of First-Born Sons

Following the judgment on the first-born in Egypt and in connection with the institution of the passover, Yahweh demanded that all the first-born in Israel be sanctified to Him (Ex. 13:1).¹⁰ The clean beasts were to be sacrificed, the unclean were to be redeemed with a lamb or killed, and the first-born of men were to be redeemed. This passage, taken at face value, must mean that Yahweh had a claim on the first-born which would have involved their death, save for His gracious provision for their redemption. Theories of interpretation which refuse to admit this minimize the sovereignty of God and the sinfulness of man. When one rightly appreciates that his very existence and his continuation in existence are dependent upon the grace of God ("It is of Jehovah's lovingkindness that we are not consumed," Lam. 3:22), then the demand of God upon the life of any particular individual will pose no problem. Prof. Sayce, although he insists that, "Abraham, in accordance with the fierce ritual of Syria, believed himself called upon to offer up in sacrifice his only son,"¹¹ nevertheless, admits that Yahweh had a claim on the first-born sons of Israel. "He could claim them, and it was of His own free-will that he waived the claim."¹² It is not surprising that expositors generally have failed to see this point since they have rejected the more ultimate thesis that human sacrifice per se is an amoral act. We contend, on the other hand, that no act is inherently moral or immoral except as it impinges on the revealed will of God. Therefore, any argument against human sacrifice which begins with the premise that God could not require such a sacrifice errs in beginning from a false premise. Since the sin of Adam, it is only by the grace of God that any man has been permitted to live. Therefore, a fortiori, it is only by the grace of God that any particular individual or group is spared.¹³

Sacrifice or Obedience

The most frequent objection raised against the Biblical presentation of Yahweh and His relationship to sacrifice is that sacrifice, whether of human beings or of beasts, is an element of primitive religion, and that Yahweh really desires not sacrifice at all but obedience. Those who argue this way support their claims with such texts as Genesis 22, urging that the outcome of the Abraham/Isaac incident proves that Yahweh was really interested in the obedience of Abraham and not the sacrifice of Isaac. Another text, frequently used is I Sam. 15:22:

And Samuel said, Hath Jehovah as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of Jehovah? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.¹⁴

The spirit of the objection is evident in the opinion of Marcus Dods with respect to the sacrifice of Isaac:

God meant Abraham to make the sacrifice in spirit, not in the outward act; he meant to write deeply on the Jewish mind the fundamental lesson regarding sacrifice, that it is in the spirit and will that all true sacrifice is made... The sacrifice God seeks is the devotion of the living soul, not the consumption of a dead body.¹⁵

This view, carried to its logical conclusion, would eliminate the necessity of the sacrificial death of Christ. This in turn eliminates the atonement and thereby abnegates the whole Christian gospel. A few commentators have seen this and candidly admitted to the consequence. Lange, for example, after drawing the distinction of two kinds of sacrifice, namely, the spiritual consecration of a man as a sacrifice, and the visible slaughter of an animal, argues that the latter is only symbolical and typical of the former. He concludes:

In the crucifixion, these two sacrifices outwardly come together, while really and spiritually they are separated as widely as heaven and hell. Christ yields himself in perfect obedience to the will of the Father, in the judgment of the world. That is the fulfilling of the Israelitish sacrifice. Caiaphas will suffer the innocent to die for the good of the people (John xi. 50), and even Pilate yields him to the will of men (Luke xxiii. 25); this is the completion of the Moloch-sacrifice.¹⁶

To assert that the death of Christ was only Pilate's idea is certainly far afield from Pauline theology which says:

...While we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son... (Rom. 5:10).

...in whom we have redemption through his blood (Eph. 1:7).

...Christ also loved you, and gave himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for an odor of sweet smell (Eph. 5:2).

The view that sacrifice is subordinate to obedience stems from two diametrically opposed points of view. Those who take the Bible seriously and regard it as indeed the written revelation of God tend to minimize the importance of Old Testament sacrifices on the basis of New Testament theology. The New Testament regards those sacrifices made under the old dispensation as subordinate and inferior to the sacrifice of Christ--"For if that first covenant had been faultless, then would no place have been sought for a second" (Heb. 8:7). They are regarded as typical or symbolic--"For the law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things, can never with the same sacrifices year by year, which they offer continually, make perfect them that draw nigh" (Heb. 10:4). On the other hand, those who do not treat the Bible with such "wooden-headed literalism" deny that God ever wanted or demanded sacrifices at all. The institution of sacrifice is a primitive, savage rite that was merely tolerated for a season until more advanced revelation could be received.

The latter position we reject on the grounds of our presupposition that the Holy Scriptures are an inspired and inerrant revelation, and the corollary that the religion of Israel is therefore essentially revealed rather than evolved. However, even apart from this premise, it is quite possible to establish with a relatively high degree of certitude that the origin of sacrifice must be accounted for on the basis of divine revelation. Hobart Freeman has pointed out that:

The universal prevalence of the practice of vicarious and piacular sacrifice...cannot be reasonably explained apart from the idea that it was derived from a common and authoritative source.¹⁷

He has also examined the only alternative explanations, namely, that the practice of sacrifice arose from (1) some dictate of reason; (2) some demand of nature; or (3) some principle of interest, and found them wholly inadequate.¹⁸

The other position, that the Old Testament sacrifices were not so important after all, is quite as serious as the liberal view, for in attempting to exalt the significance of the death of Christ, it actually has the opposite effect of undermining the basis thereof. This view also minimizes the Old Testament teaching that for the individual under the old covenant the Levitical sacrifices were the only possible means of atonement for sin and the only means through which Yahweh chose to be propitiated. Although He expected that the offerer would bring the appointed sacrifice in an attitude of repentance and faith, it by no means follows that a proper "heart-attitude" without the appropriate form would be acceptable to Yahweh.¹⁹

The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ

Having cleared away certain relatively superficial matters we come now to the crux of the whole issue. The crucial question related to the proposed sacrifice of Isaac is this: In the death of Christ, did God actually demand the sacrifice of an innocent human being as a substitutionary sacrifice for others, thereby atoning for their sins and propitiating the wrath of a holy God against them? The dilemma which this question poses for the interpreter is: If answered affirmatively, then there is no a priori ground for denying that God could have demanded the actual slaying of Isaac as a sacrifice. Indeed, if God could demand the death of his own Son as a substitutionary sacrifice, then there is more ground for expecting Him to demand the sacrifice of other human beings than for denying the same. On the other hand, if one answers negatively, then the whole basis for Christian salvation is destroyed.

Biblical Representation of the Atonement

Scholastic theologians established the proposition that our knowledge of God and spiritual realities is neither univocal nor equivocal but analogical. As such our understanding of great spiritual truths is related to a variety of figures. This is especially true of the death of Christ. Historically, theologians have erred through an unbalanced emphasis of one of the figures, excluding or minimizing the others. It is therefore important to know just what the Bible does teach, and to have a balanced picture of that teaching.

The death of Christ and its significance is the very center of the Biblical message. Texts cited here are only a representative sample of the Biblical teaching. The death of Christ is represented as:

(1) Sacrificial.

For our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ (I Cor. 5:7).

(2) Expiatory.

For if the blood of goats and bulls, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling them that have been defiled, sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? (Heb. 9:13-14).

(3) Propitiatory.

Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins (I Jn. 4:10).

(4) Redemptive.

Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree (Gal. 3:13).

(5) Representative.

For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died; and he died for all, that they that live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again (II Cor. 5:14-15).

(6) Exemplary.

For hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that ye should follow his steps (I Pet. 2:21).

(7) Triumphatorial.

You, I say, did he make alive together with him, having forgiven us all our trespasses; having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us: and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross; having despoiled the principalities and the powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it (Co. 2:15).

(8) Substitutionary.

But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed (Isa. 53:5-6).

Historical Interpretations

In the process of analysis and systematization the Church has in various periods emphasized the above aspects of Christ's death in different ways. Apart from an outright denial

of the efficacy of Christ's work none of the historical interpretations are wholly in error. They are deficient from the standpoint of what they omit rather than defective from the standpoint of what they include.

The so-called "theories of the atonement" have been enumerated and discussed voluminously. Theories have been variously grouped and separated, contrasted and compared. The most frequent division is that of (1) subjective theories, (2) objective theories, and (3) all shades of opinion on the "misty flats in between." In our discussion here we have chosen an outstanding representative from each of five distinct positions. It is our intention to show by this study that Christian orthodoxy has developed a doctrine of the atonement which harmonizes with the Biblical picture of Christ's death as a sacrifice, that this sacrifice was in accord with the eternal counsels of God, and that the sacrifice of a theanthropic person was the only possible means of securing a reconciliation between a holy God and sinful men.

Irenaeus (second century, A. D.)--We begin with the Patristic church taking as a representative Irenaeus. The early Fathers obviously believed in salvation through the work of Christ. They adhered closely to the Biblical figures in speaking of Christ's death. However, the early church had no theological formulation on the atonement--as it did, for example, on the trinity or the nature of Christ's person. For this reason it is easy to misinterpret illustrations used by the Fathers as comprising their whole concept of the doctrine. The view of the early church with respect to Christ's death has frequently been designated the "Ransom theory," or the "Devil-ransom theory." This is due to the Patristic emphasis on the redemptive aspect of Christ's work which was crudely spoken of in those days as a ransom price paid by God to Satan. It was deemed necessary, in light of man's bondage to sin, death, and Satan, that the ransom for men's souls be paid to Satan, their captor. It is true that this concept formed a common motif in those early discussions.

And since the Apostasy [i.e. the rebellious spirit, Satan] unjustly held sway over us, and though we were by nature [the possession] of Almighty God, estranged us against nature, making us his own disciples; therefore the Word of God, mighty in all things and not lacking in his own justice, acted justly even in the encounter with the Apostasy itself, ransoming from it that which was his own, not by force, in the way in which it secured the sway over us in the beginning, snatching insatiably what was not its own; but by persuasion, as it became God to receive what he wished; by persuasion, not by use of force, that the principles of justice might not be infringed, and, at the same time, that God's original creation might not perish.²⁰

Irenaeus further spoke of Christ's redeeming and sanctifying every stage of human life by his recapitulation of the same in his own life.

For we have shown that the Son of God did not then begin to exist since he existed with the Father always; but when he was incarnate and made man, he recapitulated [or summed up] in himself the long line of the human race, procuring for us salvation thus summarily, so that what we had lost in Adam, that is, the being in the image and likeness of God, that we should regain in Christ Jesus.²¹

Later writers, particularly Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius, and Augustine, elaborated the theory of Irenaeus into a fantastic scheme whereby God deceived Satan, as with a fish-hook or mouse-trap, and thus gained the victory over Satan and his forces.

These views, though not a technical theological formulation, characterized the thought of the church for about a thousand years, until the writing of Anselm's Cur Deus Homo.

Anselm (1033-1109). --Few writings in the history of Christianity have had an influence comparable to Anselm's Cur Deus Homo. For all its brevity, it marks a turning point in Christological and soteriological thought. Cur Deus Homo is really the first serious attempt to define the nature of the atonement. As such it should be the terminus a quo of all subsequent discussions.²²

In contrast to Augustine's view that it was good or fitting that God forgive sinners on the basis of Christ's sacrifice, Anselm attempted to prove by logical argument that there was no other way.²³ Only God himself could repay man's infinite debt and only a man could make that payment for men. He attacked the old ransom theory, particularly the idea that Satan had certain "rights" over men. Sin is a violation of God's law, an offense to His honor and majesty. It is therefore the honor of God that must be satisfied rather than the claims of Satan.

The theory of Anselm was largely cast in the terms of feudal society. It was addressed more to the honor or majesty of God than to His holiness. His view, however, was refined by the reformers, especially Calvin, later by John Owen and Jonathan Edwards, and is still held by consistent Calvinists. The view of Anselm, albeit with refinements and variation, is defended by James Denny, George Smeaton, T. J. Crawford, Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge, W. G. T. Shedd, A. H. Strong, L. S. Chafer, and others of our own era. It is variously referred to as the commercial view, the penal view, the satisfaction view or the substitutionary view.

Abelard (1079-1142). --The objective theories²⁴ were based on the view of sin as a violation of God's law. Man stands separated from God by reason of his own personal sin as well as by reason of his inherited guilt from Adam's sin. He is helpless to change his status of condemnation apart from a sovereign intervention of grace. It is altogether reasonable that the Pelagian view of sin²⁵ should generate a theory of the atonement that enables man to help himself. This type of theory, so-called the subjective or moral influence, was given classic expression by Peter Abelard. In his opinion the purpose of the death of Christ was to impress man with the love of God and thereby morally influence him to surrender his life to God.²⁶ Sin is forgiven gratis on the sole condition of repentance and a desire to do better. In his commentary on Romans, Abelard writes:

Now it seems to us that we have been justified by the blood of Christ and reconciled to God in this way: through this unique act of grace manifested to us--in that his Son has taken upon himself our nature and persevered therein in teaching us by word and example even unto death--he has more fully bound us to himself by love; with the result that our hearts should be enkindled by such a gift of divine grace, and true charity should not now shrink from enduring anything for him.²⁷

A generation ago this theory was defended with various modifications by Albrecht Ritschl and Fredrich Schliermacher of Germany (mystical theory); Edward Irving and McLeod Campbell of Britain (respectively, the theories of gradually extirpated depravity and vicarious repentance); and Horace Bushnell of America (theory of vicarious sacrifice).

This view of Christ's work was one of the outstanding features of modernistic theology and is by no means dead today. William Adams Brown, leading modernist theologian, taught that Christ's saving work consisted of the revelation of the loving character of God which calls forth an answering love in us. This revelation influences us morally by what it shows us to be true.²⁸ Nels Ferré believes that, "Forgiveness is free and direct to those who are willing henceforth to live responsibly on the Father's terms for the family."²⁹ Unitarians subscribe to the example variation of Abelard's theory.

Grotius (1583-1645).--In the seventeenth century, Hugo Grotius of Leyden, Holland, propounded a theory which Warfield calls a half-way-house between the objective and subjective views.³⁰ His view is called the governmental or rectoral theory and is expressed in legal terminology--Grotius himself being a brilliant lawyer. Sin is regarded as rebellion against the government of God. God in his love will forgive sin but he must demonstrate publicly that He will not condone sin and thus make forgiveness possible.³¹

This theory has been adopted and defended by Arminian theologians from the reformation onward. It is really the highest form of atonement doctrine logically conformable to Arminian theology which rejects the doctrine of imputation, either of sin or of righteousness. Defenders of the governmental view include Charles Finney, F. Godet, R. W. Dale, Alfred Cave, John Miley, and Marcus Dods.

Aulén (Prof. of Systematic Theology, University of Lund).--The ransom theory of the early church, though it erred in the matter of God's deceiving and bribing Satan, had the value of emphasizing man's bondage to Satan and the necessity of his being freed from that bondage by the work of Christ. It supported the objectivity of Christ's work. Luther also emphasized Christ's death as a victory over Satan and man's deliverance from sin, death, and the law. The old view--which was not, as we have noted, a systematic formulation at all--has been revived in our day by a group of Swedish theologians, notably, Gustaf Aulén, and primarily in his book, Christus Victor.³² He refers to his view as the "Classic" or "Triumphantorial" view.

Describing his own view, Aulén writes:

It was...my intention to emphasize that the outlook of the Atonement as a drama, where the love of God in Christ fights and conquers the hostile powers, is a central and decisive perspective which never can be omitted and which indeed must stamp every really Christian doctrine of the Atonement.³³

A recent neo-orthodox writer, William Hordern, praises Aulén for rescuing the true view from the unfortunate terminology in which it was expressed. He argues,

It would be strange indeed if the Bible taught the fundamentalist or Anselmic doctrine and if for the first thousand years of Christianity no one recognized it.³⁴

Hordern also notes that Aulén's view has found wide acceptance among neo-orthodox thinkers because it combines the incarnation and the atonement.³⁵

The Atonement in Modern Thought

A generation ago, B. B. Warfield said:

Voices are raised all about us proclaiming a "theory" of the atonement impossible, while many of those that essay a "theory" seem to be feeling their tortuous way very much in the dark. That, if I mistake not, is the real state of affairs in the modern church.³⁶

If that darkness shrouded the theological discussion in Warfield's day, and he was presumably a qualified judge, his characterization is certainly no less true of the situation today.

It is sufficient for our present purpose to note several outstanding characteristics of the contemporary (i.e., post-reformation) discussion of the atonement.

First, let it be noted that the noncommittal attitude to which Warfield made reference is still with us. William Hordern, in his popular handbook, A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology, candidly admits this:

Whereas fundamentalism makes the Atonement central, modern orthodoxy³⁷ tends to make the Incarnation central. Fundamentalism is committed to one view of atonement--the substitutionary death of Christ for the sins of man. Modern orthodoxy is, in line with historic Christianity, hesitant to make any doctrine of atonement final. The result is that the death of Jesus is of central importance for fundamentalism, while modern orthodoxy, like liberalism, looks to the whole life of Jesus. In particular, modern orthodoxy emphasizes that the Resurrection of Jesus cannot be separated from his atoning work.³⁸

An Objective theory: Sine Qua Non.--One of the striking characteristic of this area of thought in our own day is the quest for a satisfactory objective theory. Objective, that is, except for the "morally objectionable" penal and substitutionary elements of traditional orthodox theology.³⁹ Leon Morris, of Ridley College in Melbourne, Australia, has pointed out this characteristic in a splendid article in His magazine. He writes:

Marked dissatisfaction with purely moral theories of the atonement has been evident in recent years, and very few (if any) front rank theologians put forth such views nowadays. This does not mean that any unanimity of opinion exists, but it does mean that men are feeling for some theory which will be objective, and yet will not outrage the ideas of our day.⁴⁰

Morris explains that the most popular view is one or another variation of the representative theory. That is, Christ was not our substitute nor was his death a sacrifice as such but he did do something that serves as a basis for reconciliation.

He was not separate from sinners in His suffering, but dying in their name, dying for their sake, dying in a way which avails for them.⁴¹

In his important work, God Was in Christ, C. M. Baillie struggles with the problem of defining a theory which is objective and yet avoids the notions of sacrifice, substitution, and propitiation. He denies that Christ's death was a true sacrifice at all--though Old Testament sacrificial terms are used to describe it.⁴² The New Testament expression hilasmos has nothing to do with appeasing an angry God, "For the love of God is the starting place."⁴³ In fact, the Old Testament sacrificial terminology is completely transformed by the usage of the New Testament.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, he insists that God did something objective and costly in Christ to make reconciliation possible. The objective element, that which is "Ordained and accepted by God, in 'expiation' of human sin, quite apart from our knowledge of it," is the sacrifice which God is continually making of himself and to himself by suffering on account of sin.

...He is infinite Love confronted with human sin. And it is an expiatory sacrifice, because sin is a dreadfully real thing which love cannot tolerate or lightly pass over, and it is only out of the suffering of such inexorable love that true forgiveness, as distinct from an indulgent amnesty, could ever come.⁴⁵

Aulén, too, as we have noted,⁴⁶ although he denies the "commercial" view does set forth an objective theory.

Christ--Christus Victor--fights against and triumphs over the evil powers of the world, the 'tyrants'⁴⁷ under which mankind is in bondage and suffering, and in Him God reconciles the world to himself.⁴⁸

In short, modern theologians have come to recognize that an objective theory is the conditio sine qua non of any atonement theory that purports to be Biblical.

Christ's death as a sacrifice--Another significant feature of recent Christological thought is the recognition of Christ's death as a sacrifice. Oliver Quick, C. H. Dodd, Vincent Taylor, and A. M. Hunter have given support to this view. The death of Christ is regarded as the fulfillment of Isaiah 53. Christ died vicariously in the interests of sinful men and forgiveness is mediated through his sacrifice.⁴⁹

Wm. Hordern, in the work cited above, says in reply to Abelard: "Christ's death can only be a revelation of God's love for man if it was a necessary sacrifice. It is meaningless if man could be saved without it."⁵⁰ His own view of Christianity is:

Whereas most religions believe that man has to do something to atone to God, Christianity teaches that God himself performed the atoning work. Other

religions perform sacrifices in order that God might turn his angry face back toward man and forgive him. Christianity teaches that God has performed a sacrifice, in and through Jesus, which has brought God and man back into fellowship with each other.⁵¹

By and large, however, the theologians of our own day who use the terminology of Old Testament sacrifice in speaking of the death of Christ do not mean that Christ's death was a sacrifice in that sense. Rather, sacrifice is distinguished as to (1) Sacrifice as a sacrificial gift, a votive offering. Man offers something of his own property as a sacrifice on the altar of his deity. (2) Man's offering of obedience, justice and righteousness, mercy and love. This is the ethical way of sacrifice. This was the essence of the prophetic message in the Old Testament. And (3) the sacrifice of a broken spirit--the offering, that is, of the man himself in humility. This is the religious way of sacrifice.⁵²

The sacrifice of Jesus Christ, however, is of wholly different character. "It is God's own sacrifice."⁵³ The sacrifice of Christ is both God's own act of sacrifice and also a sacrifice offered to God.⁵⁴ Aulén insists that the Anselmic view "develops the latter aspect, and eliminates the former."⁵⁵

The immorality of substitution.--Despite any concessions that theologians have made toward a truly Biblical Christology, on one point there is no change. The idea of substitution, of vicarious punishment, is immoral! I call to witness three voices from the past, not because things have changed, but because the attitude was formerly expressed more candidly (or crudely) than now. The most cursory perusal of contemporary literature will reveal that the attitude on this point, though expressed with greater refinement, remains unchanged.

Abelard:

Indeed, how cruel and wicked it seems that anyone should demand the blood of an innocent person as the price for anything, or that it should in any way please him that an innocent man should be slain--still less that God should consider the death of his Son so agreeable that by it he should be reconciled to the whole world!⁵⁶

P. T. Forsyth:

Does God's judgment mean exacting the utmost farthing or suffering? Does it mean that in the hour of his death Christ suffered, compressed into one brief moment, all the pains of hell that the human race deserved? We cannot think about things in that way. God does not work by such equivalents. Let us get rid of that materialistic idea of equivalents. What Christ gave to God was not an equivalent penalty, but an adequate confession of God's holiness, rising from amid extreme conditions of sin.⁵⁷

Horace Bushnell:

On the whole this matter of contrived compensation to justice which so many take for a gospel, appears to contain about the worst reflexion upon

God's justice that could be stated...The justice satisfied is satisfied with an injustice....The penalties threatened, as against wrongdoers are not to be executed on them, because they have been executed on a right-doer! viz., Christ.⁵⁸

Vicarious punishment on our level would, of course, be a serious miscarriage of justice and indeed immoral. The death of Christ, however, is not strictly analogous to the case of a human judge punishing an innocent third party in the stead of a condemned criminal. At least the analogy dare not be pressed. In the case of Christ's sacrifice there is only one party beside the condemned. He is, "Judge, Wronged Party, King (or Law), and Substitute."⁵⁹ The case is wholly unique and the same Bible which declares it so to be also declares the impossibility of any other substitutionary atonement apart from this.⁶⁰

The Relevancy of the Atonement for the Interpretation of Genesis 22

As a result of this inquiry into the problem of human sacrifice certain key factors emerge as guidelines for the interpretation of Genesis 22. Nor do we lack for New Testament warrant in drawing such an analogy. Paul certainly alluded to Abraham's experience in Romans 8:32 where he writes of Christ's sacrifice: "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all..."⁶¹

(1) The Biblical record certainly represents Christ's death as a sacrifice and the orthodox Christian community has recognized it as such. Inasmuch as Jesus Christ was indeed the Son of Man, his death is a human sacrifice.

(2) Those who deny that the New Testament use of sacrificial terminology has reference to the Levitical offerings do so on the basis of a distorted concept of the idea of sacrifice. This distorted concept is in turn due to the gratuitous assumption of the evolutionary development of the institutions of Israel's religion.

(3) To speak of the immorality of God's acting in any particular way is an exhibition of pride which elevates the judgment of man above that of God. Such evaluations make man the standard of universal morality and thereby reveal a wholly inadequate concept of ethics. Man is the measure of all things.

(4) To insist that God could not have demanded the sacrifice of Isaac on moral grounds would lend support to the view that God could not have demanded the sacrifice of Jesus Christ for the same reason. Contrariwise, if the death of Jesus Christ is a true sacrifice, what ground is left for denying the possibility of God's demanding the sacrifice of Isaac?⁶²

(5) The fact that Isaac was not put to death in no way alters the analogy for from the viewpoint of both Abraham and God he was already sacrificed⁶³ and his coming down from the altar was tantamount to a resurrection from the dead. This was the focal point of Abraham's test: He believed that God would raise the son of promise from the dead.⁶⁴

THE NATURE OF THE SACRIFICE OF ISAAC

In light of these considerations we proceed to several lines of argument which support the traditional view that Abraham was instructed and expected to offer Isaac as a whole burnt-offering in the usual manner of such sacrifice.

The Divine Origin of the Command

The text of Genesis 22:1 clearly reads: "And Elohim tested Abraham" (translation and underlining are mine). The serious exegete cannot escape the fact that this text teaches the divine origin of the idea for this sacrifice without resorting to a most subjective hermeneutics. By way of contrast, modern interpreters, who do not feel duty bound to protect the reputation of Abraham (or for that matter, of Abraham's God), tend to attribute the idea to Abraham himself. The suggestion that Abraham was only acting in accordance with the custom of his day is quite popular.

Here in the story of Abraham and Isaac there is embedded the fact that once men not only practiced human sacrifice, but did it at what they thought was divine command.

If men worshipping pagan deities could carry their religion to that terrific cost, how could Abraham show that his religion meant as much to him? Only by being willing to go as far as he did.⁶⁵

In primitive Israelitish religion every first-born male was regarded as the property of Yahweh.... The story of the sacrifice of Isaac is almost certainly reminiscent of a progress from barbarism to enlightenment.⁶⁶

We regard as highly improbable the notion that Abraham became aware of this command through the ordinary action of his conscience. Isaac was a miraculous child of divine promise. On him rested the only hope of divine blessing for Abraham and all mankind. He was the sole channel for the ultimate bestowal of eternal salvation. He was therefore to Abraham the charter of his salvation. That Abraham would have himself conceived the idea for Isaac's sacrifice is too great a strain on one's imagination.

The Terms of the Command

Abraham was instructed to "offer him there for a burnt-offering." The verb 'alah means to go up, or ascend; in the hiphil, to cause to go up, and therefore, with respect to sacrifices, to offer. The 'olah is the whole burnt-offering. It goes up in the flame of the altar to God expressing the ascent of the soul in worship. The 'olah is a particular type of sacrifice. It was the sacrifice that was completely consumed by the fire on the altar. It is significant that the sacrifice of Isaac is not called a minḥah (a gift, present, or offering), a more general term that would have more suitably described a so-called "spiritual sacrifice" had that been intended. Neither is it called a zebāḥ, the general name for sacrifices eaten at the feasts. It is not a ḥaṭa't nor an ʾāšām, a sin or trespass offering. The sacrifice of Isaac was not intended as a sacrifice for sin. It was an expression of Abraham's own worship and de-

votion to Yahweh. In light of the universal usage of 'olah for a sacrifice that is wholly consumed by fire, it is only reasonable to expect some qualifying phrase if this were not the actual intent.

New Testament Evidence

By faith Abraham, being tried, offered up Isaac: yea, he that had gladly received the promises was offering up his only begotten son; even he to whom it was said, In Isaac shall thy seed be called: accounting that God is able to raise up, even from the dead; from whence he did also in a figure receive him back (Heb. 11:17-19).

Was not Abraham our father justified by works in that he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? (Jas. 2:21)⁶⁷

From these texts as well as from Gen. 22:12, "For now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me," we learn that from the standpoint of both Abraham and God the sacrifice of Isaac was complete. Abraham had gone far enough that there was no question or doubt that he would complete the sacrifice. God was satisfied. Abraham was so sure of Isaac's death that his coming down from the altar was tantamount to a resurrection from the dead. It is therefore a figure or type of Christ's death and resurrection for, auton kai en parabolai ekomisato. This argument is also sustained by the use of the perfect tense of prospherō in Hebrews 11:17. Pistei prosenānochen Abraam ton Isaak peirazomenos.

Analogy to the Sacrificial Death of Christ

We have endeavored in this study to point out the analogous relationship between the sacrifice of Isaac and the death of Christ as a sacrifice. No interpretation of Genesis 22 can be adequate that fails to consider the Christological and soteriological implications thus involved. An analogy, however, does not bear an exact correspondence to the reality in every detail, else it would cease to be an analogy and become an exact equivalent to the reality.

The sacrifice of Isaac corresponds to that of Christ in the following respects: (1) They are in both cases the sacrifice by a father of his only son. (2) They both symbolize a complete dedication on the part of the offerer. And (3) they are in both cases a human sacrifice.

On the other hand, no single sacrifice in the Old Testament was sufficient in itself to fully typify the ultimate sacrifice of Christ. Only by a composite view of all the different offerings is Christ's death adequately pictured. The sacrifice of Isaac could never have pictured the most essential idea in the sacrifice of Christ, namely, substitution. Isaac was not an adequate substitute. It is doubtless for this reason that the hand of Abraham was stayed and another "parable" introduced, for the substitution of a ram in the stead of Isaac is certainly an adequate type of a substitute ransom. It is perhaps the clearest illustration of substitution in the whole Old Testament. Thus the two sacrifices taken together complement each other in their respective representation of the death of Christ. The sacrifice of Isaac

has the merit of adding that dimension which is lacking in all other Old Testament sacrifices, that God's own sacrifice would be a human sacrifice, and beyond that, the Son of the Offerer Himself.

DOCUMENTATION

1. John Calvin, Commentary on the First Book of Moses Called Genesis, trans. John King (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1948), I, 563.
2. R. A. S. Macalister, "Human Sacrifice: Semitic," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings, VI, 863. This seal is described in detail by Macalister in this article. For another such seal see: The Jewish Encyclopedia, VIII, 653.
3. A. H. Sayce, Patriarchal Palestine (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1895), p. 183.
4. According to Albright, "The extent to which human sacrifice was practiced among the Canaanites has not been clarified by the discoveries at Ugarit, which nowhere appear to mention it at all." W. F. Albright, Archaeology and the Religion of Israel (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942), p. 93.
5. W. F. Albright, "Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands," Young's Analytical Concordance to the Bible (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1955), p. 34.
6. The burden of this paper is to demonstrate that human sacrifice per se is an amoral act. Its acquired morality is dependent on the command or prohibition of God.
7. The chief texts are: Lev. 18:21; 20:1-5; Deut. 12:31; 18:10.
8. The chief texts are: Jer. 7:31, 19:1-13; 32:35; Isa. 57:5; Ezek. 20:31; 23:37.
9. Exod. 20:3. Paul Tillich has accurately observed that the greater the act of faith or worship offered to an idol, the greater the abomination to the True God. Dynamics of Faith (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1957), pp. 11ff.
10. The Biblical material is found in: Exod. 13:1-16; 22:29; 34:20. On the redemption of the first-born by the substitution of the Levites and the payment of five shekels, see: Num. 3:40-51; 18:15ff.
11. A. H. Sayce, The Early History of the Hebrews (London: Rivingtons, 1897), p. 51.
12. Ibid., p. 47.
13. In order to avoid the extreme of hyper-Calvinism, the whole matter of divine election must be viewed in this light. It is not that God elects some men to salvation and some to perdition; but that of all men, already doomed, God has graciously chosen to sovereignly elect some to the joys of salvation.
14. Parallel ideas are expressed in the following texts from the Prophets: Amos 5:21-24; Isa. 1:11; Jer. 6:20; and Mic. 6:6-8.
15. Marcus Dods, The Book of Genesis, The Expositor's Bible, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll (New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1900), p. 200.
16. John Peter Lange, Genesis, trans. and ed. A. Gosman, Commentary on the Holy Scriptures, ed. J. P. Lange, trans. and ed. Philip Schaff (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n. d.), p. 80. Italics mine.
17. Hobart E. Freeman, "The Doctrine of Substitution in the Old Testament" (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Ind., 1961), p. 103.
18. Ibid., p. 96.
19. For a thorough treatment of this idea, see "The Problem of the Efficacy of the Old Testament Sacrifices," Hobart Freeman, op. cit., pp. 335-358.

20. Henry Bettenson (ed.), Documents of the Christian Church (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 43.
21. Ibid., p. 42.
22. This of course has not been the case inasmuch as recent neo-orthodox theologians have returned to the "classic" or early church view.
23. Robert S. Paul, The Atonement and the Sacraments (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1960), p. 68.
24. Both the ransom theory and the commercial theory are "objective" in that they describe an effect secured apart from man which serves as the basis for his reconciliation. "Subjective" theories emphasize the work of Christ in and for the believer.
25. Pelagius denied that man inherited either guilt or a sin-nature from Adam. Every man is as free as Adam. Some men sin; others never do. As Adam was a bad example to influence men to sin, so Christ is a good example to influence men to holiness.
26. Earle E. Cairns, Christianity Through the Centuries (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1958), p. 256.
27. Cited by Paul, op. cit., p. 82.
28. Kenneth S. Kantzer, Unpublished notes on the Philosophy of Religion (Wheaton College, 1958).
29. Ibid.
30. B. B. Warfield, The Person and Work of Christ, ed. S. G. Craig (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1950), p. 379.
31. Advocates of this view distinguish retributive justice from public justice. Christ's death satisfies the demands of public justice only. For this reason we judge that the governmental theory really reduces to another variation of the moral influence theory. There is no objective ground for God's forgiving of any particular sin.
32. Gustaf Aulén, Christus Victor (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1961), passim.
33. Gustaf Aulén, "Chaos and Cosmos: The Drama of the Atonement," Interpretation, IV (April, 1950), p. 156. Obviously, we do not deny that this was a part of Christ's work. For a conservative statement of this aspect see: Wendell E. Kent, "The Spoiling of Principalities and Powers," Grace Journal, III (Winter, 1962), p. 8.
34. William Hordern, A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1958), p. 203. In reply it should be noted that before the corruption of the Church began under Constantine, theological discussion was largely concerned with the basic issues of the Scriptures, the nature of the Trinity, and the person of Christ. It is no more surprising that the early church had no technical statement of the Atonement than that it had no precise ecclesiology or eschatology.
35. Ibid. That is, because it differs from the subjective view of liberalism, which neo-orthodoxy regards as bad, and also from the objective view of fundamentalism, which neo-orthodoxy regards as impossible!
36. Warfield, op. cit., pp. 376-77.
37. That is, what we more commonly call "neo-orthodoxy."
38. Hordern, loc. cit. How interesting that the delay of the church in addressing itself to the problem of the atonement is sufficient warrant to declare that no doctrine of the atonement is final. But the same author has no qualms about denying the truth of propositional revelation--a truth on which the church has spoken and spoken clearly. Ibid., p. 188.
39. Samuel J. Mikolaski, "The Atonement and Men Today," Christianity Today, V (March 13, 1961); 3.

40. Leon Morris, "Penal View of the Atonement and Men Today," Christianity Today, V December, 1960), 33.
41. Ibid.
42. D. M. Baillie, God Was in Christ (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948), p. 177.
43. Ibid., p. 187.
44. Ibid., p. 175, et passim.
45. Ibid., p. 198.
46. See the discussion of Aulén's atonement theory, above.
47. That is, sin, death, and Satan.
48. Aulén, Christus Victor, p. 4.
49. Mikolaski, op. cit., p. 3.
50. Hordern, op. cit., p. 34.
51. Ibid.
52. Anders Nygren, Agape and Eros, trans. Philip S. Watson (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), pp. 120-21.
53. Ibid., p. 122.
54. Aulén, Christus Victor, p. 77.
55. Ibid.
56. Cited by Paul, op. cit., p. 81.
57. Ibid., p. 236.
58. Ibid., p. 152.
59. H. E. Guillebaud, Why the Cross? (London: Inter-Varsity Fellowship, reprtd., 1956), p. 147.
60. Ibid., p. 148.
61. The Greek expression ouk epheisato (spared not) is the same as the LXX translation in Gen. 22:16 which reads: ouk epheisō tou huiou sou tou agapātou di' eme. The form is aorist middle (deponent) from pheidomai: third person, singular, in Rom. 8; second person, singular, in Gen. 22.
62. This is not to say that the proposed sacrifice of Isaac was in any sense substitutionary or piacular in nature. In this respect Jesus' death is wholly unique.
63. Cf. Gen. 22:12, 16; Heb. 11:17; and Jas. 2:21.
64. Heb. 11:17
65. Walter Russell Bowie, Genesis, The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1952), I. 642, 644.
66. C. R. North, "The Redeemer God," Interpretation, II, (Jan. 1948), p. 5.
67. On the supposed conflict between James and Paul over the justification of Abraham by faith or works, see G. C. Berkouwer, Faith and Justification, trans. Lewis B. Smedes (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), pp. 134-139.

GENERAL REVIEW

Events viewed in the Light of God's Word

HERMAN A. HOYT

President, Grace Theological Seminary

"BUT AFTER THIS THE JUDGMENT"

No single event in almost twenty years has electrified the entire world as has the assassination of the President of the United States. From the moment of its certainty, every news agency of the United States, to say nothing of those belonging to foreign powers, centered their undivided attention upon this event. Without apology the normal schedules of business, schools, athletics, religion and pleasure were set aside for a period of four days, and every energy was concentrated on this national calamity and the ensuing global crisis.

News media, especially that of radio and television, made it possible to inform the entire world within minutes after the tragedy, and to keep the world informed of every new development in the unfolding significance of this event. Even after four days, the multiplying mountains of evidence leave the people amazed, mystified, stunned. As of this hour there is no adequate explanation for this monstrous crime. In the turn of events, the public is being swept along with the tide, and there is no apparent evidence that interest will abate.

Millions of words have been written and spoken bearing on every detail and aspect of this situation. Any discerning analyst will have noted the prominence given to an evaluation of the late President, John F. Kennedy. This is human, natural, and logical. For "it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment" (Heb. 9:27). In the normal processes belonging to the round of life, it is impossible to evaluate fully any life until that life has run its course. Once death has occurred, then the issues of that life can be gathered, processed, and evaluated.

Under the emotional pressures of the moment, high tribute is being paid to this man. Friends and enemies alike are paying respects to his phenomenal rise to the highest position in the nation and to the place of greatest power in the world. In this hour of mourning there is evidence of a sincere disposition to weigh the worth of this man and his contribution to society. It remains for the sobering facts of history, however, to provide the context for the more accurate analysis of this man and his ministry.

"WHO SHALL BE ABLE TO STAND?"

During these past four days, the crisis of a nation and the world, instinctively men have turned to God as a source of hope, as a means of comfort, as a stabilizing force. Regardless of religious faith, without rancor or criticism, all have joined in turning to the supernatural as the last resort for assuaging sorrow and discouragement. All this comes within the context of the last several years when the powers of the Constitution of the United States have been invoked to rid the schools of our land and public life in general of the very thought of

religion and God. Yet with amazing contrast, in the hour of human extremity, without seeming recognition of incongruity and without apology, all men were turning to prayer, the Bible, and God. Contrariwise, there was a strange and ominous silence from the atheists in this hour of supreme need.

Prophecy marks a time in the future when philosophical atheism will suddenly cease to have any validity. The sixth seal is opened and universal disturbance runs its course throughout the entire fabric of nature. The sun will turn into darkness at midday, the moon become blood, the stars fall, the earth quake, the mountains move, the islands walk, and every class of society will cry out in paralyzing fright to the mountains and the rocks, "Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: For the great day of his wrath is come; and who shall be able to stand?" (Rev. 6:16-17).

Recently one young atheist wrote, "We atheists will, for our part, continue our efforts to oust religious hogwash from public life. We intend to strike the words 'under God' from the Pledge of Allegiance, remove religious mottoes from coins, end the use of courtroom oaths, kick chaplains out of Congress and the military, end tax exemptions for churches, and strike down anti-evolution laws. Our day of triumph is in sight . . . Yours for a Godless America, (signed) Member, Freethinkers of America." But in the presence of national sorrow and global crisis, the voice of the atheist was strangely silent. In that day when God begins to speak from heaven, their voice will be heard, but in shrieks of terror, "Who shall be able to stand?"

"BUT GOD IS THE JUDGE"

At that moment when the supreme leader and national hero has been struck down, it behooves people to lift their eyes to that One who sits on the throne of the universe. Twenty-five hundred years ago a similar crisis came in Israel. King Uzziah died. For fifty-two years he had reigned. It was a long, glorious reign. To the young prophet, Isaiah, whose whole life had been lived during the dominion of Uzziah, there came darkness and depression as a result of the death of the king. In that hour of need God gave a vision. "In the year that King Uzziah died, I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne" (Isa. 6:1). In His sovereign plan and purpose, God "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will" (Eph. 1:11). This extends even to the rise and fall of kings.

In this hour of sorrow at the passing of our leader, well may all people, and especially those who own Christ as Lord, remember that "promotion cometh neither from the east, nor from the west, nor from the south: But God is the judge; he putteth down one, and setteth up another" (Ps. 75:6-7). The passing of the President was "to the intent that the living may know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will" (Dan. 4:17). What appears to men to be the untimely termination of the administration of John F. Kennedy was in reality the fulfillment of God's wise and beneficent plan for this country, as must be concluded from the study of God's holy Word.

Even the method, as well as the time, of his passing was somehow in that plan. God permitted, though He did not cause, this monstrous crime, as He did in the case of Christ. But He will hold the murderer guilty for the deed (Matt. 26:24). It would have been better if that man had not been born. But in all this God proves Himself to be sovereign.

BOOK REVIEWS

SERMONS FOR THE JUNIOR CONGREGATION
By George W. Bowman III. Baker Book House,
Grand Rapids, 1962. 118 pp. \$1.95.

Among pastors a modern trend is to preach an additional sermon for the younger members of the morning worship hour, or to hold a Junior Church service simultaneously with that hour. Out of his ministry, the author has selected thirty-five short and pithy sermons for juniors. These sermons could be employed by pastor or teacher for almost any junior program. Minister of Faith Baptist Church at South Boston, Virginia, Pastor Bowman does not claim originality for each thought in his book. Some of the illustrations are well known to the average reader, but with these a new application of spiritual truth is made. While it is not necessary to use objects with the sermon, the author recommends the employment of such to produce a more effective message. The content of the sermons is interesting and the titles are catchy. In his Foreword, Pastor Bowman gives several helpful suggestions on the preparation and delivery of sermons to juniors. This work is a part of the "Minister's Handbook Series" by Baker Book House.

The reviewer suggests a listing of Scripture references with the sermon titles of the Contents to make this a more valuable tool. If evangelism is a desired goal of the user, then, he must add salvation scriptures and thoughts to most of these sermons.

JAMES H. GABHART

Union Gospel Church
Waterloo, Iowa

THE WORD OF GOD ACCORDING TO ST. AUGUSTINE. By A. D. R. Polman. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 242 pp., \$5.00.

The chief value of this book will be for serious students of Augustine's thought. The author quotes heavily from Augustine and may be taken as an authoritative statement. Augustine was probably the greatest mind between the apostles and the reformers, and the book cannot help revealing more of his thought than only his bibliography.

The book shows Augustine's view of the Word of God. Those who digest its thick prose will find a complete statement of his acceptance of the divine self-revelation. An incidental value of the book, however, may have lain outside the author's intentions.

The book reveals clearly how Augustine can be considered the father of both the Catholic and the Protestant traditions: he knew the Bible as few men ever have, yet the book shows his easy disregard for the literal statements of Scripture. It was this disregard, this figurative interpretation, that enabled him to confuse the church with the kingdom. From the many quotations the reader may gauge for himself how far Augustine submitted to the New Testament and how far he stood in judgment over it.

ROBERT G. DELNAY

Central Conservative Baptist
Theological Seminary

PROFITABLE BIBLE STUDY. By Wilbur M. Smith. W. A. Wilde Company, Pub. 166 pp., \$3.75.

Since the first edition was published in 1939, many Bible students have profited from the guidance of Dr. Smith in the personal study of the Holy Scriptures. It would be very well to place this book in the hands of every

newly born-again believer for the benefit of the practical encouragement to Bible study. The value of the book is greatly enhanced by the fact that every idea is explained in simple language which even a grade school convert can understand. However, at the same time, this book will call for greatest humility as it comes into the hands of preachers and theological students who may sometimes be adept at mastering the content of Scripture but still limp along on a starvation diet for their own souls. Chapter two will therefore be of some encouragement to most Christians as its title indicates, "Eight Methods for Studying the Bible for Our Own Soul's Nourishment."

Of course, the other chapters of the book will also lend encouragement to Bible study. The examples of the "Bible-Reading Habits of Four Well-Known Americans" are given for the purpose of showing that nobody can excuse himself from personal study.

Last, but obviously not least, because it seems to be the one characteristic of the book which gives it its greatest publicity, is Dr. Smith's book list for the Bible student's library. In previous editions it was the now-familiar title of "The First One Hundred Books for the Bible Student's Library." In this new edition, however, the title has been changed to "Basic Books (and a Few Others) for the Bible Student's Library." Because of the great amount of literature being written in our day such a list of outstanding books is of great value to many who do not have the opportunity of hearing of the many titles. Even Dr. Smith acknowledges that it is impossible for one man to be acquainted with all the literature now being published. He has truly done a great service to English Bible students by suggesting these over one hundred titles which are of outstanding value.

ALVA F. GOOSSEN

Winona Lake, Indiana

HOW TO ORGANIZE YOUR CHURCH OFFICE
By Clara Anniss McCartt. HOW TO RECRUIT
AND KEEP SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS.
By John R. Scotford. HOW TO PUBLICIZE
CHURCH ACTIVITIES. By William J. Barrows,
Jr. HOW TO ORGANIZE YOUR CHURCH
LIBRARY. By Alice Straughan. Fleming H.
Revell Company, Westwood, N. J., 1962.

The above titles represent the first four books of the paperback Better Church Series. These books are attractive in appearance and uniform in size, but vary in quality and usefulness. By far the most valuable book of the series is How To Organize Your Church Office. This work is a practical handbook with discussions and suggestive operational lists as diverse in nature as the actual services in church administration. While the book is most helpful to the larger church, the small group with the pastor as sole administrator will also find much help herein. There is an incorporation of modern business practices with a logical application to the church office. Cautions on the utilization of office personnel and the purchase of equipment are worth the price of this book.

How to Recruit and Keep Sunday School Teachers considers problems and pitfalls of the modern Sunday School. The author shows how the trends of modern education are reflected and handled in the Sunday School. There are several helpful suggestions as to the dedication, breaking-in, rotation, and dismissal of teachers. The author correctly states that the organizations who prepare Sunday School lessons for today seek the least common denominator theologically.

How to Publicize Church Activities gives suggestions and illustrations on gaining attention for the work and witness of the local church. Although the book is written with an eye to the larger church, there is help for all groups in the discussion of publicity by the newspaper, Sunday bulletin, and the church

bulletin board. Suggestions such as cooperative publicity with Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish participants (p. 47) will be disagreeable to some readers.

How to Organize Your Church Library is written to help untrained personnel establish a library in the local church. The author briefly discusses the staff, equipment, cataloguing, and publicity of the church library. While several helpful discussions are given on topics such as the Dewey Decimal System, many evangelical readers will find unsatisfactory the choice of books for a \$50.00 Church Library (pp. 29-31) and some of the suggested methods for financing a church library (pp. 26, 27).

JAMES H. GABHART

Union Gospel Church
Waterloo, Iowa

THE NEW EVANGELICALISM. By Ronald H. Nash. Zondervan Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 188 pp. \$3.95

This book is an apology for neo-evangelicalism. It is the result of a dedicated and determined effort to prove that the new evangelicalism is neither new nor the same as contemporary fundamentalism which the author says is co-extensive with dispensationalism. The author, who recently taught philosophy at Barrington College and Houghton College and who is now a candidate for the Ph.D. degree at Syracuse University, believes that others have not told the truth or have told it poorly about the new evangelicalism and therefore he intends to don the role of a corrector and a clarifier.

Nash attempts to accomplish this task by dividing his work into six parts. Parts I through III relate to the rise of the new evangelicalism and its position on Bibliology and ecclesiology. The relation of philosophy to the new evangelicalism is presented in Part IV.

Part V is given over to the critics of the new evangelicalism and Part VI constitutes the conclusion of the work.

The author reveals the dilemma in which neo-evangelicalism in general and he in particular finds himself. On the one hand he wants neo-evangelicalism to rid itself of fundamentalism, at least as it is associated with the "dismal morass of dispensationalism" (p. 176); and on the other hand to find shelter and security in its doctrinal emphasis and belief.

Mr. Nash fails to display the love for the fundamentalists which he sees lacking in them. Too, a note of Pharisaism runs throughout the work. Frequently Nash makes broad and bold critical statements about those with whom he disagrees without adequate support. For example, "Hackett has made a serious blunder" (p. 133), Buswell's remarks "are quite obscure" (p. 134), Van Til's argument is based on "a false analogy" (p. 107), and Ashbrook's argument is "vaguely formulated, unclearly supported and decidedly misleading" (p. 148). Perhaps one of the most serious and obvious notes of Pharisaism is Nash's implication that those who differ with his type of evangelicalism are "non-evangelicals" (p. 173).

Three chapters in Part II are devoted to the inspiration, authority and inerrancy of Scripture. Since this is the crucial area of present difference between fundamentalism and neo-evangelicalism one would expect a clear forthright presentation of the neo-evangelical position. Nash fails to do this. He does admit that neo-evangelicals "are willing to reopen the subject of the inspiration of the Scriptures" (p. 35). To prove that neo-evangelicals believe in inspiration Nash naturally turns to those in the movement who accept inspiration. It is questionable, however, whether some of the men whom Nash quotes as neo-evangelicals would appreciate the company in which he places them.

While Nash has presented the views of men whom he identifies as neo-evangelical on the subject of inspiration he has failed to tell the reader precisely what the new evangelical position is especially regarding verbal inspiration. One would still like to ask, "Do you believe in Orr's conceptual revelation or Warfield's verbal inspiration?" Why could not Nash be as emphatic here as he is in his rather unrelated section of the philosophical presuppositionalism of neo-evangelicalism?

The lack of a crystal clear statement regarding the new evangelical view of authority is also evident. Nash has told us how inconsistent Hordern is, what neo-orthodoxy believes and how Bernard Ramm differs with it, but he has not told us clearly what neo-evangelicals believe.

Nash nowhere states belief in the total inerrancy of Scripture but he does admit this might (italics mine) be the case: "The autographs may (italics mine) have been inerrant while later translations and versions are adequate, albeit not perfect, representations of the original message" (p. 66). Mr. Nash has made it clear that "contemporary evangelicals are pointing out that inspiration and inerrancy are not equivalent concepts" (p. 75) and that "the Bible does not teach the inerrancy of its original manuscripts" (p. 76). It is in these very areas that contemporary fundamentalism, dispensational and nondispensational, has serious disagreements with Nash's new evangelicalism.

After one deletes Nash's discussion of the reformers, Machen, Carnell and Van Til, on the question of ecclesiastical separation in Chapter 6, there is practically nothing left. The issue is not what these men have or have not done but what the Word of God teaches, which Nash fails even to mention.

The chief conflict which fundamentalism has with the new evangelicalism is not with the

latter's antidispenationalism, its desire to make the gospel effective on society, or its desire to advance intellectually, nor even with the dislike of the term fundamentalism; but with the increased concessions which a significant number of neo-evangelicals are making in vital fundamentals of the faith, especially in the doctrine of the Scripture. That an attitude of indecision, uncertainty, and even avowed disbelief in total inerrancy exists among some neo-evangelicals is a fact known and admitted by both friends and foes of neo-evangelicalism. A significant number of neo-evangelicals accept the double-revelation theory of inspiration. For a well documented refutation of this theory, see John C. Whitcomb, "Biblical Enerrancy and the Double-Revelation Theory," Grace Journal, Winter, 1963. Nash's work, especially in the area of Bibliology, has only amplified the existing confusion in this most crucial area of doctrine.

The fundamentalist does not disregard nor disparage scientific research, as Nash would imply. The fundamentalist approaches the subject quite differently however. He believes science must be accommodated to the Bible instead of the Bible to science. God has spoken about the creation of the world, of man and many other scientific matters and where He has, His Word must be accepted even though it may conflict with "scientific discovery." Conflict between science and the Bible is not the signal to concede; it is the signal to have confidence in God's immutable Word rather than in the mutable discoveries of man.

Every book should be judged by the success or failure of its author to fulfill his intended purpose, whether the reader agrees with that purpose or not. The author of this book failed to demonstrate that the movement he describes is not new (p. 177). He does not adequately present the real issues between neo-evangelicalism and fundamentalism. The doctrinal position which he sets forth is woefully wanting in clarity and preciseness. By a comparison of

the clear and forthright doctrinal statements set forth in The Fundamentals with Nash's fuzzy and fluid presentation, the reader must decide for himself whether the new evangelicalism may rightfully claim to be identical with the doctrinal position of early fundamentalism (p. 6).

Neither has the author answered the critics of the new evangelicalism. He has listed the criticisms of those who consider neo-evangelicals as "half-hearted heretics" and those who consider them as "misguided brethren," but in neither case has he disproved their basic criticisms. This section (Part V) abounds in non-sequitur and ad hominem arguments. This is especially true in Chapter 11 where Nash labors long and hard to discredit my own work--Neo-Evangelicalism (Findlay, Ohio: Dunham Publishing Co., 1962). A casual reading of these criticisms will reveal the fact that while Nash clearly states his criticisms he does not prove his accusations. He does not prove that my premises are wrong, that the criticisms are too general and universal, nor that the doctrines have been misrepresented. He vehemently affirms these things to be true of the one he criticizes but fails to prove adequately his point. In some instances Nash fails to present the opponent accurately. Many illustrations could be cited but a sampling will suffice. Nash states that this reviewer implied that all Conservative Baptists are opposed to neo-evangelicalism (p. 162). This is hardly justifiable in light of the presentation in Neo-Evangelicalism (p. 92). Again, Nash accuses the reviewer of stating that the National Association of Evangelicals represents neo-evangelicalism (Nash, p. 162). The fact of the matter is that

the father of neo-evangelicalism, Harold John Ockenga, clearly stated that this was the case (The Park Street Spire, February, 1958, p. 7). Nash also claims that the reviewer classified neo-evangelicals as post-millennialists (Nash, p. 162). This too is a gross misrepresentation since the original statement was not at all inclusive of all neo-evangelicals as Nash would have his readers believe (Lightner, p. 81-82).

As this book was read and studied the evaluation of neo-evangelicalism by Sherman Roddy kept coming to mind, as Nash so unwittingly yet perfectly portrayed Roddy's sentiments: "These new evangelicals are involved in a dilemma. They must wear the old garments of fundamentalism while changing the man within. For political and economic reasons they are reluctant to appear as friends of the enemy, even though privately they recognize the enemy as part of the Christian Community. They live with a double standard ("Fundamentalism and Ecumenicity," The Christian Century, October 1, 1958).

This book will be of value to all who are interested in hearing the neo-evangelical side of the story. A neo-evangelical presentation of its doctrinal position has been long overdue and therefore it is regrettable that this volume is not more positive and constructive. Instead of accomplishing the author's desire to throw water on the fire between fundamentalism and neo-evangelicalism, this book will no doubt fan the blaze.

ROBERT LIGHTNER

Baptist Bible Seminary



GRACE JOURNAL

A PUBLICATION OF GRACE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
Winona Lake, Indiana

SPRING 1964

VOL. 5

NO. 2

GRACE JOURNAL

A publication of Grace Theological Seminary

VOLUME 5

SPRING, 1964

NUMBER 2

GOD'S MESSAGE TO MAN THROUGH THE PROPHETS

The Bauman Memorial Lectures for 1964

at

Grace Theological Seminary and College

by

Charles L. Feinberg

I. THE COMMANDING IMPORTANCE OF THE PROPHETIC SCRIPTURES	3
II. THE PROPHETIC WORD AND ISRAEL	10
III. THE PROPHETIC WORD AND THE NATIONS	16
IV. THE PROPHETIC WORD AND THE CHURCH	21
* * * * *	
GENERAL REVIEW	35
BOOK REVIEWS	38
BOOKS RECEIVED	43

GRACE JOURNAL is published three times each year (Winter, Spring, Fall) by Grace Theological Seminary, in cooperation with the Grace Seminary Alumni Association.

EDITORIAL POLICY: The editors of **GRACE JOURNAL** hold the historic Christian faith, and accept without reservation the inerrancy of Scripture and the premillennial view of eschatology. A more complete expression of their theological position may be found in the Statement of Faith of Grace Theological Seminary. The editors, however, do not necessarily endorse every opinion that may be expressed by individual writers in the **JOURNAL**.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$2.00 per calendar year; single copy, 75c.

ADDRESS: All subscriptions and review copies of books should be sent to **GRACE JOURNAL**, Box 397, Winona Lake, Indiana.

Copyright, 1964, by Grace Theological Seminary. All rights reserved.

EDITORIAL STAFF

HOMER A. KENT, JR.
Editor

JOHN C. WHITCOMB, JR.
Managing Editor

HERMAN A. HOYT
General Review Editor

S. HERBERT BESS
Book Review Editor

JAMES L. BOYER
E. WILLIAM MALE
KENNETH G. MOELLER
Business Committee

ALVA J. McCLAIN
HOMER A. KENT, SR.
PAUL R. FINK
Consulting Editors

GRACE JOURNAL is indexed in CHRISTIAN PERIODICAL INDEX.

GOD'S MESSAGE TO MAN THROUGH THE PROPHETS

I. THE COMMANDING IMPORTANCE OF THE PROPHETIC SCRIPTURES

CHARLES L. FEINBERG

Dean and Professor of Semitics and Old Testament
Talbot Theological Seminary

The fact that for many centuries the study of eschatology suffered immeasurably from those who held and enthusiastically propagated extreme and wild notions concerning the future, should not blind our eyes to the importance of eschatology. It is a matter of common agreement between both the Church and the world that we are living in perplexing times. It is not surprising to find that, although the greatest minds of the world are engaged with the state of world affairs, they have been able to come to no final nor satisfying conclusion as to either the cause of or the cure for present conditions.

The rank and file of the world are interested only as their own lives are touched by these circumstances, and, sadly enough, many untaught Christians are to be found in this group. The latter ask: "Why worry about present conditions or future events? If we live for Christ and testify for Him here and now, He will take care of the rest." Is it, then, merely a fancy on the part of some Christians to find out something not meant for them, when they seek to learn the things that lie ahead? We think not for several reasons.

It was the Dutch theologian van Oosterzee who succinctly wrote: "All true Theology is at the same time Teleology, which must of itself lead to Eschatology." From a general examination of the Word of God it will be found that there are seventeen books strictly prophetic in the Old Testament, besides the many portions of eschatological import in other books. Further study will reveal that fully one quarter of the Bible is prophecy, which rightly includes all that was predictive at the time of its utterance. With such a large place given to eschatology in the Word by the Spirit, it not only deserves, but commands our faithful and prayerful study. It certainly was never in the purpose of God that such a large portion of His Word should be neglected.

But if possible, the believer of this age has more reason to be interested in prophecy and its themes than ever before, because it is one of the purposes for which Christ sent the Spirit into the world. The Scriptures reveal an eightfold ministry of the Spirit in this age. He restrains evil in the world; He is said to reprove the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment; it is through His agency that regeneration is effected; He dwells in every believer who becomes a temple of the Holy Spirit by faith in Christ; it is His office work to baptize all believers into the body of Christ; the Spirit of God seals every believer, Himself being the seal;

the obedient and yielded believer is filled with the Spirit; and the Holy Spirit guides into truth.

It is with this last phase of the Spirit's ministry that we are here particularly interested. John in writing to believers reminds them that the anointing they have received of God abides in them, so that they have no need that man should instruct them. The anointing suffices to teach all things. Moreover, before His departure from this world the Lord Jesus in the upper room discourse recorded by John, declared to His disciples that, although He had been with them for some time, there were yet many things which they could not bear at that time. But, they are told, when the Spirit of truth comes into the world, He will guide into all truth and will show (lit. disclose) them "things to come." With the Spirit present and willing to teach us, we ought to be willing to listen to His teaching.

Eschatology is of inestimable value and importance, furthermore, because of the testimony it yields to the omniscience and omnipotence of our God. When Isaiah was exhorting Israel in Babylon to see that their God was greater and mightier than the gods of Babylon, even though the Babylonians had taken Israel captive from their land, he pointed out among other things that the gods of heathen Babylon were totally incapable of showing and declaring future events to prove their claim to worship. But, on the other hand, the true God can say, "Before they spring forth I tell you of them" (Isa. 42:9). Again and again God is represented by the prophet as saying, "Yea, I have spoken it, I will also bring it to pass; I have purposed it, I will also do it" (Isa. 46:11).

Another reason for the significance attached to eschatology is that it is an indispensable ally of a normal Christian walk and service. As in former times, much is heard these days in religious circles, of the great task lying before the Church of bringing in the kingdom. Such energy is misdirected, and were better utilized along lines consonant with the eternal purposes of God in Christ Jesus for this present age. Others are laboring in the Church to make the world a better place in which to live, to mitigate as far as possible the line of cleavage and separation between the Church and the world. The result is a Satanic social gospel and a situation in which the Church is to be found in the world and the world in the Church. Eschatology furnishes the answer to the question as to the work of the believer in this age.

But there is more than this. A knowledge of prophecy, particularly of the imminent return of the Lord, is conducive to a proper Christian walk. Values are seen in their relative importance. There is not a dissipating of purpose and energy between the things of this world and those of heaven. A wise teacher once attributed the suffering and misery of man to the fact that he has one foot in the finite and one in the infinite, with the result that he is torn asunder between two worlds. Many Christians are attempting to walk with Christ, while they consort with the world. The cause is often to be found in their lack of knowledge of prophetic things, which would have a strong tendency to draw their eyes from the things of this world, and to fix them upon Christ and His future purposes.

Quite a substantial benefit that accrues to those who study the prophetic word is that of comfort. When believers at Thessalonica were mourning for their loved ones as those who

have no hope, Paul directs their attention to one eschatological event in the possibly near future. At another time when these same Christians are perplexed as to the meaning of their present sufferings in the faith, Paul points out to them clearly and convincingly that their fears are unfounded, and that they do well to rest in the security which God has provided for them in a coming day. And it has ever been thus. Church history recounts time and again instances where groups during the Middle Ages found comfort and consolation in the contemplation of the millennial hope, notwithstanding the fact that most of the time their conceptions were grossly materialistic. Assuredly, he spoke wisely who aptly said, "Only he who knows prophecy can dwell in the calm of eternity now."

Probably the most cogent reason for the importance of eschatological study is to be seen in the position or place of the present age. In his valuable work, The Progress of Dogma, James Orr shows with his usual ability and clarity that Christian doctrine has not only a chronological development, but a logical one as well. For instance, it follows the accepted lines of systematic theology: first, Bibliology (the fixing and defining of the canon of Scripture); then, Theology Proper (Arian, Nestorian, Eutychian, Monophysite, and Monothelite controversies); then, anthropology (Pelagian controversy); and so on.

Has it ever struck you, then . . . what a singular parallel there is between the historical course of dogma, on the one hand, and the scientific order of the textbooks on systematic theology on the other? The history of dogma . . . is simply the system of theology spread out through the centuries--theology, as Plato would say, "writ large"--and this not only as regards its general subject-matter, but even as respects the definite succession of its parts. The temporal and logical order correspond. The articulation of the system in your textbooks is the very articulation of the system in its development in history. Take, for example, any accredited theological textbook, and observe the order of its treatment. What we ordinarily find is something like this. Its opening sections are probably occupied with matters of Theological Prolegomena--with apologetics, the general idea of religion, revelation, the relation of faith to reason, Holy Scripture, and the like. Then follow the great divisions of the theological system--Theology proper, or the doctrine of God; Anthropology, or the doctrine of man, including sin (sometimes a separate division); Christology, or the doctrine of the Person of Christ; Soteriology (objective), or the doctrine of the work of Christ, especially the (p. 22) Atonement; Subjective Soteriology, or the doctrine of the application of redemption (Justification, Regeneration, etc.); finally, Eschatology, or the doctrine of the last things. If now, planting yourself at the close of the Apostolic Age, you cast your eye down the course of the succeeding centuries, you find, taking as an easy guide the great historical controversies of the Church, that what you have is simply the projection of this logical system on the vast temporal screen.¹

What now shall I say of the remaining branch of the theological system, the Eschatological? An Eschatology, indeed, there was in the early Church,

but it was not theologically conceived; and a Mythical Eschatology there was in the Mediaeval Church--an Eschatology of Heaven, Hell, and Purgatory . . . But the Reformation swept this away, and, with its sharply contrasted states of bliss and woe, can hardly be said to have put anything in its place, or even to have faced very distinctly the difficulties of the problem, as these force themselves upon the modern mind, with its larger outlook on the ways of God and providence. Probably I am not mistaken in thinking that . . . the modern mind has given itself with special earnestness to eschatological questions, moved thereto, perhaps, by the solemn impression that on it the ends of the world have come, and that some great crisis in the history of human affairs is approaching.²

Such has been the case until now there are before the minds of men who are studying the Scriptures, the great themes of predictive prophecy as never before.

The prophet Daniel was told at the end of his prophecy to close up and seal the words until the time of the end (12:9). The time of the end is, according to verse 4, to be characterized by two features. Many will run to and fro, and knowledge will be increased. It has been suggested that the prophet is foretelling the tremendous increase in travel and communication, and the growth in knowledge, which are so characteristic of this century. We are inclined to believe, however, that the meaning of the prophet is otherwise. Our interpretation of the passage on the basis of the Hebrew is: the time of the end is to be characterized by the perusal of the contents of the prophecy of Daniel (other prophecies are not necessarily excluded, because they would aid in the interpretation and understanding of this prophecy), and the knowledge of the contents of the Book of Daniel will be increased. Such is the case today and is ample reason that, since we are in the time of the end, much emphasis should be placed upon eschatology.

Since there are so many reasons that can be brought forth in favor of the necessity and significance of prophetic study, one would expect that eschatology would hold a prime place in works of theologies and in the curricula of theological seminaries. But, despite what we have said in regard to the increase in prophetic study in recent times, eschatology remains a much neglected field of theological study and research.

Furthermore, there is distinct peril in neglecting the study of prophecy. Neglect of prophecy results in:

DISOBEDIENCE TO THE LORD'S WILL

To neglect prophecy is to neglect large segments of the Word of God which we are commanded to preach in its entirety (II Tim. 4:1-4). In preaching Christ we must preach prophecy (Rev. 19:10). Prophetic truth throws light on all the other doctrines of the faith. Prophecy is part of the ministry of warning (II Tim. 3:15; I Thess. 5:1, 2) and the ministry of comfort (I Thess. 4:13). Paul's example: Acts 20:20, 27. To neglect prophecy is to fail to heed the charge to hearken to the prophetic Scriptures as a light in a dark place (II Pet. 1:19). See Luke 24:25: It is the prime, though not the only, cause of Israel's rejection of Christ.

A minister once went from a town into the backwoods to preach to the settlers, and had to return at night, when it was very dark. A backwoodsman provided him with a torch of pitch-pine wood. The minister, who had never seen anything like it, said, "It will soon burn out." "It will light you home," said the other. "The wind will blow it out," said the preacher. "It will light you home," was the answer again. "But what if it should rain?" "It will light you home," was the answer again. Contrary to the minister's fears, the little torch gave ample light all the way home. God's prophetic light is sufficient to light our pathway home to glory.

DISREGARD OF PROOF OF THE BIBLE'S DIVINE INSPIRATION

Read such passages as Isa. 45:21; 41:21-23; 46:9-13; Dan. 2:47; and II Pet. 1:20-21. God alone can predict; prediction is a miracle of utterance. These texts settle for all time the truth that the Bible is inspired of God. Prophecy is a confirmation of divine omniscience and omnipotence--His word relative to Moab, Edom, Assyria, Egypt, Syria, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, Rome, Nineveh, Sodom, Gomorrah, Tyre, Sidon, Philistia; those concerning Christ, Israel, the Church, and the Gentiles. No movement of world importance, but what the Word has predicted it long beforehand: world conflicts; spiritual declension; rise of dictatorships; widespread fears and calamities.

ALTERATION OF THE CHURCH'S PREACHING

If the Church neglects prophecy, she will invariably fail to conform to God's revealed plan in her preaching. It will be "convert the world," "reform the social order," "bring in the kingdom," "do away with all war and lawlessness." Think of the effort expended to bring about world peace. God's purpose is found in Acts 15:14, 15, 16. The Lordship of Christ must be preached or man will try to be that Lord himself. Compare Hitler, Nietzsche, Stalin, and others. When prophecy is neglected, the Church invariably turns to a solely ethical interpretation of Christianity, and begins to stress morality instead of regeneration, new birth, and conversion. Never forget; just the preaching of morals does not bring about morality. We have had that kind of message in this country for some forty years, and the plane of morality today, according to secular estimates and authorities, is lower today than then (the Exchange Club in the East for the exchange of wives). When Christ's kingdom and coming are neglected or rejected, the result is a social gospel. Men put their energies into communal and world reform. Preaching then comes from the Sermon on the Mount, and not on the fact and accomplishment of the Cross. When the Cross is preached, society never fails to feel the effect of it. Dr. Walter Rauschenbush wrote this amazing statement: "The worst thing that could happen to God would be to remain an autocrat while the world is moving toward democracy. He would be dethroned with the rest of the rulers." He was a foremost social gospellizer. If the Church had kept in view the authority and coming of Christ, we should not be hearing a liberal theologian say: "Democracy demands a God with whom men can cooperate and not to whom they must submit."

LOST MISSIONARY INTEREST AND ZEAL

When prophetic truth is soft-pedaled, then missions suffer. Soon we hear of attempts for world amalgamations of all religions. The Laymen's Inquiry and "Rethinking Missions" are

indicative of the havoc wrought. E. Stanley Jones wrote in his Christ's Alternative to Communism: "When the western world was sunk in armaments and the Church seemed a part of that war spirit, God reached out and laid hold of Mahatma Gandhi, and through him let us see some of the meanings underlying the Sermon on the Mount!" When the prophetic Word is laid aside, every straw is grasped at to spell out the coming of the kingdom of Christ. If the Church does not sound the alarm, the unsaved elements in the visible Church will sweep on to contribute their weight to the establishment of an anti-Christian kingdom on earth.

A Christian leader of China visited this country some years ago. One Sunday he spoke in a modernistic church in California. At the conclusion of the message a young college student asked this question: "Why should we export Christianity to China when you have Confucianism in your country?" The answer was, "There are three reasons. First of all, Confucius was a teacher, and Christ is a Savior. China needs a Savior more than she needs a teacher. In the second place, Confucius is dead, and Christ is alive. China needs a living Savior. In the third place, Confucius is some day going to stand before Christ to be judged by Him. China needs to know Christ as Savior before she meets Him as Judge." How true!

CHANGE IN THE CHURCH'S OUTLOOK AND TESTIMONY

As a matter of history, when the Church shut her mouth on prophecy, the Church became wedded to a worldly system and a dead Churchianity in the Middle Ages (it is still with us), emphasizing form and externalities to the detriment of the core of the matter. If the hope of the Lord's coming had been kept bright, the Church would have achieved a greater degree of unity, purity, and power. Many more would realize the truth and reliability of the whole Word, viewing the marvels of fulfilled prophecy. Its message to Israel would be more effective, being able to set events concerning her in the proper Scriptural light, relative to her glorious future (Isa. 60:1 ff.). This is still one of the best methods of winning Jews to Christ as Savior.

When the Church is lulled to sleep in these matters, it is disastrous. It is a standing reproach to the truth of the Word. A French dramatist read his latest production to a circle of critics, and while he was reading, one of the critics fell asleep. The reader stopped long enough to say, "How can you criticize my production when you are sound asleep?" Rubbing his eyes, the critic said, "I submit that sleep is a criticism." And so it is. If Christian truth is worth anything, it means everything, and a Christian asleep on the vital matter of prophecy is a perpetual argument against the truth. Prophecy will not put us to sleep but to work.

From the positive angle a study of the prophetic Scriptures will accomplish several things for the willing heart:

(1) It will bring us near to God (Gen. 18:17 and Jn. 15:14, 15). Friends, not servants, are told confidences. In prophecy God invites us into His deepest plans. What attitude is that which cares much for God to provide our daily need, but will not listen to Him disclose His plans?

(2) It affords a knowledge of world-wide purposes. What vast subjects are handled! The greatest in the world: the destiny of Israel, the nations, the Church, the goal of men: heaven or hell, the reign of Christ on earth. What a cure for narrow-mindedness or limited vision!

(3) It brightens hope (Rom. 8:24a). This element plays a large part in the believer's life. It has a relation to all he is, hopes to be, and will experience in realization. Faith looks up and back; love looks around; hope looks onward.

(4) It presents the words and speech of God, as does the rest of the Word (Deut. 29:29). God has spoken in prophecy. This is paramount. Whenever and wherever and however God speaks, it is our duty to listen and obey.

(5) It affords the true perspective of history (Rom. 11:36). Sometimes in the midst of the affairs of life our vision gets blurred and out of focus. It is prophecy that gives us the proper perspective of history. Only in its light can we know our day (II Pet. 1:19).

(6) It purifies the life (I Thess. 3:11-13; II Pet. 3:11, 14; I Jn. 3:1-3). It is a mighty force to shape the life in conformity with God's will for our sanctification. Chief Sekomi said to Livingstone in Africa, "I wish you would change my heart. Give me medicine to change it, for it is proud, proud and angry, angry always." He would not hear of God's way but wanted an outward means. God has provided cleansing by the blood of Christ in salvation and through the believer's experience. Prophetic truth is an aid to this end.

(7) It influences our service (I Thess. 2:19). All truth in the Word of God is meant in one way or other to influence or affect our service. If it has not or does not, we have misunderstood it or wilfully failed to apply it. If the study of prophecy has not and does not affect our service for God, we have not felt the full power and force of it. We have not permitted it to touch our lives.

DOCUMENTATION

1. James Orr, The Progress of Doctrine, p. 21.
2. Ibid., pp. 29, 30.

GOD'S MESSAGE TO MAN THROUGH THE PROPHETS

II. THE PROPHETIC WORD AND ISRAEL

CHARLES L. FEINBERG

Is there a future for the nation Israel? On this pivotal question all systems of prophecy divide. There is probably no more comprehensive theme in all prophecy than this.

Those who interpret the prophetic Scriptures figuratively or symbolically hold that all Old Testament predictions relating to Israel are realized in the Church, and there remain no promises for Israel in the future. On the other hand, Bible students who interpret prophecy literally find many Scriptures predicting a glorious future for God's ancient people. Indeed, so central and significant is the place of Israel in God's future program that all prophecy must be misunderstood and twisted if this phase of prophecy is not given its rightful emphasis.

One of the keenest German philosophers, Hegel, an ardent student of the philosophy of history, said when speaking of the history of Israel, "It is a dark, troublesome enigma to me. I am not able to understand it. It does not fit in with any of our categories. It is a riddle." If it is dark, the Word of God can throw light upon it. If it is an enigma, the Bible can unravel it.

The last references to Israel in Scripture in relation to their past history indicate their spiritual failure in rejecting their Messiah, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Luke states it thus: "And he said unto them, O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" (Luke 24:25-27; this and following Scriptures are from the A.S.V.).

Paul approaches Israel's failure from the angle of the law. Says he, "What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, who followed not after righteousness, attained to righteousness, even the righteousness which is of faith: but Israel, following after a law of righteousness, did not arrive at that law. Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by works" (Rom. 9:30-32).

The result of this national departure from the Lord has been their setting aside, as far as national testimony is concerned, for the centuries of the Christian era. So thoroughgoing has been this dealing of God with Israel, that many have been ready to conclude that "God is through with the Jews." But what say the prophetic Scriptures?

One of the inexplicable (on human grounds) phenomena of the centuries has been the preservation of the nation Israel. God had an ultimate purpose in view when He protected and preserved this people through the more than four hundred years of Egyptian bondage and the

seventy years of Babylonian exile. Now the Lord has kept His wayward nation through almost two millennia of world-wide dispersion, persecution and wandering.

It was the prophet Jeremiah who was commissioned of God to deliver a message of a most unrelieved judgment to Israel. But it is precisely he who is so insistent that God will not suffer the extinction of the nation. The testimony is as explicit as possible; "For I am with thee, saith the Lord, to save thee: for I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have scattered thee, but I will not make a full end of thee; but I will correct thee in measure, and will in no wise leave thee unpunished" (Jer. 30:11; also 31:35-37 and 46:28).

Unquestionably, Israel has been kept nationally in order that there may be a regathering and restoration to the land. Our generation is witnessing the preliminary stages of this return, which is in unbelief (Zeph. 2:1, 2). The restoration to the land of promise is set forth under a twofold aspect: the first a preliminary and seemingly human movement, and the second a clearly miraculous undertaking from God. The passages are so numerous--extending from Moses to our Lord Jesus--that we shall have to be selective. The first prediction of return from world-wide scattering is found in Deuteronomy 30:1-10:

And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee, and shalt return unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey his voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul; that then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the peoples, whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee. If any of thine outcasts be in the uttermost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee: and the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers. And the Lord thy God will circumcise thy heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live. And the Lord thy God will put all these curses upon thine enemies, and on them that hate thee, that persecuted thee. And thou shalt return and obey the voice of the Lord, and do all his commandments which I command thee this day. And the Lord thy God will make thee plenteous in all the work of thy hand, in the fruit of thy body, and in the fruit of thy cattle, and in the fruit of thy ground, for good: for the Lord will again rejoice over thee for good, as he rejoiced over thy fathers; if thou shalt obey the voice of the Lord thy God, to keep his commandments and his statutes which are written in this book of the law; if thou turn unto the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul.

The comprehensive scope of the passage is clear and unmistakable.

Isaiah builds upon this early testimony and reveals that the return will be patterned after the exodus from Egypt (11:11-16), that the Lord will set Israel in their own land (14:1), that the trumpet of God will supernaturally assemble the outcasts (27:13), and that when all topographical hindrances are removed, the exiles will come from the far points of the compass

(49:12, 13). The great evangelical prophet even points out the role that the Gentiles will play in this return (Isa. 49:22, 23; 60:9, 10).

As already stated, though Jeremiah was called upon to herald a message of doom, he has a glorious word concerning the return. In parallel passages he emphasizes the grand scale of the restoration (Jer. 16:14, 15; 23:3, 7, 8; 24:6-9; 30:3; 33:7-9). Ezekiel, a younger contemporary of Jeremiah, with the results of Israel's disobedience manifest before him in the Babylonian exile, lifts his eyes to a better day (Ezek. 34:28) and sees that God will accomplish a regathering for His name's sake (Ezek. 36:21-32), and reunite the long divided nation (Ezek. 37:21-25).

Among the minor prophets Amos foretells a day when exiles will be over (Amos 9:14, 15); Micah predicts the assembling of all the afflicted (Mic. 4:6-8); and Zechariah specifies such a large regathering that room will be at a premium (Zech. 10:10).

In words reminiscent of Isaiah's prophecy our Lord Jesus prophesied that the trumpet of God would sound for the angels to gather God's earthly elect from all the areas of earth (Matt. 24:29-31). Part of the regathering will take place before the time of Israel's trial, and a portion of it will be realized at the end of their age. Suffice it to say, the restoration of Israel to their land is so ingrained and interwoven into the warp and woof of Old and New Testament (Rev. 11) prophecy, that violence must be done large portions of Scripture, if this truth be rejected.

The rapture of the Church (I Cor. 15:50-58 and I Thess. 4:13-18) will find Israel, constituted as a nation, back in the land. There God will resume dealings with them, and from the place where relationships were suspended after the rejection of their Messiah. It will be a time of unprecedented distress and tribulation for the nation.

Numerous passages in the prophets treat of this time of seven years, called Daniel's seventieth week or the time of Jacob's trouble. Jeremiah gives the proper sequence of this period of judgment as after their return to the land (30:3), and continues: "Ask ye now, and see whether a man doth travail with child: wherefore do I see every man with his hands on his loins, as a woman in travail, and all faces are turned into paleness? Alas! for that day is great, so that none is like it: it is even the time of Jacob's trouble; but he shall be saved out of it" (30:6, 7).

Daniel reveals that in this time of national distress Michael the archangel will espouse the cause of Israel (12:1). The unbelieving mass of the nation will have made a pact with the ruler of the revived Roman Empire (Dan. 9:27), but the godly will be witnessing (Rev. 7:4-17) and be purged and refined (Zech. 13:7-9). Passages like Psalm 2:4, 5; Isaiah 26:20, 21; Zephaniah 2:3; Zechariah 12:1-9; 14:1-5; Matthew 24 and 25; Luke 21; Mark 13; and Revelation 4-19 treat of this important period in Israel's national life. Although the time is pre-eminently related to Israel, unbelieving Gentiles will be included also (Ezek. 30:3: "a time of the nations").

Certain Scriptures underscore the fact that during and after the tribulation period, the nations will suffer the judgment of God upon them for their treatment of God's people, Israel.

This is the intent of Psalm 2:1-6; Isaiah 63:1-6; Zechariah 12:1-9; 14:1-5; and the famous conclusion to the significant Olivet Discourse (Matt. 25:31-46).

In another sense, and equally valid, part of this same prophetic era is viewed as God's special assize for Israel. Apart from the well-known passages in Malachi 3:1-6 and Matthew 24:37-25:30, the testimony of Ezekiel 20:33-38 is especially explicit:

As I live, saith the Lord God, surely with a mighty hand, and with wrath poured out, will I be king over you. And I will bring you out from the peoples, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered, with a mighty hand, and with wrath poured out; and I will bring you into the wilderness of the peoples, and there will I enter into judgment with you face to face. Like as I entered into judgment with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so will I enter into judgment with you, saith the Lord God. And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant; and I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me; I will bring them forth out of the land where they sojourn, but they shall not enter into the land of Israel: and ye shall know that I am the Lord.

The events of the wilderness journeyings of Israel, when the rebellious were purged out before the entrance into Canaan, are made the pattern of the future judgment of the nation before the earthly reign of Messiah over a cleansed people.

It is not generally realized that the resurrection of the righteous is in several stages (I Cor. 15:22-24). The prophetic Scriptures of the Old Testament record a twofold resurrection of Israel: physical and national. Isaiah 26:19 states the first phase in general terms. But Daniel 12:1, 2 furnishes us with the vital chronological element:

And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince who standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

After the time of Israel's tribulation there will be the resurrection of the godly of the nation of all periods. The unsaved will appear at the Great White Throne (Rev. 20:11-15).

The national resurrection of Israel is another way of stating their reinstatement as a nation into the favor of God. The famous passage by Ezekiel on the valley of dry bones (37:1-14) graphically depicts this transaction. Isaiah has in mind the same prophetic event in 66:7-9:

Before she travailed, she brought forth; before her pain came, she was delivered of a man-child. Who hath heard such a thing? who hath seen such things? Shall a land be born in one day? shall a nation be brought forth at once? for as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children. Shall I bring to the birth, and not cause to bring forth? saith the Lord: shall I that cause to bring forth shut the womb? saith thy God.

The event will be so startling and unprecedented that the prophet introduces it by a repetition of attention-arresting questions.

When the student of prophecy comes to the subject of the repentance and salvation of Israel, he is confronted at once with what the French call an embarrassment of riches. It is like going into the forest to find trees; it is all trees. As was stated above, Moses predicted this important event (Deut. 30:1-10, especially verses 2, 6, 8, and 9). No prophet excels Isaiah when he dilates repeatedly on this theme (2:1-4; 44:22, 23; 59:20, 21; 61:1-3).

The reader of Scripture who finds Jeremiah dwelling only on judgment will be surprised to find the large place he gives to the conversion of his people to the Lord at the end of their tribulation (the famous passage on the new covenant in 31:31-34; 32:37-41; and 33:14-17). Micah does not close his message before he describes the removal of the transgression of Israel (7:18-20), and Zephaniah, who is so full of the message of the day of God's wrath, will not conclude his testimony until he gives us a golden passage that sets the heart to singing (3:14-20). James the Wise at the Council of Jerusalem points to the day when "the residue of men may seek after the Lord" and goes on to speak of the conversion of the Gentiles as well (Acts 15:17). The words of Hosea (5:15) beautifully dovetail with those of our Lord Jesus (Matt. 23:37-39).

Zechariah, the greatest of the minor prophets, declares: "And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication; and they shall look unto me whom they have pierced; and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn" (12:10).

At that time they will enter into the fountain opened for the world at Calvary (Zech. 18:1). The Spirit of God has allowed us to know beforehand the heartfelt confession of Israel as they come to the Lord. It is none other than Isaiah 52:13-53:12.

Paul, having made a comprehensive comparison in Romans 11:15, states Israel's conversion thus: "And so all Israel shall be saved: even as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer; he shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: and this is my covenant unto them, When I shall take away their sins" (Rom. 11:26, 27). The chronological setting is found in Romans 11:25. No event of the future is more certain and assured than the repentance, conversion, and salvation of Israel.

The feasts of the Lord in Leviticus 23 serve as an indicator of the sequence of events in Israel's national life. It is the Feast of Trumpets, the Feast of the Day of Atonement, and then the Feast of Tabernacles. Such is the order: regathering, repentance, and rest. Rest will be theirs in both millennial and eternal glory. This people, so long without a country of their own and now with a political economy which rests so uneasily, has been promised a kingdom of matchless glory. Daniel foretold it (7:22), our Lord predicted it (Matt. 19:28), and John foresaw it (Rev. 20:4-6).

This vast theme is best studied under several features which characterize the millennial and eternal state. The glories of the millennial era will be heightened and merge into those

of the eternal ages. During the reign of the Messiah over Israel drastic geographical innovations will take place. Waters will be dried up to allow them passage (Isa. 11:14-16); barren places will become gloriously productive (Isa. 35:1-7 and 65:8-10); and the entire land of promise will undergo radical topographical transformation (Zech. 14:9-11).

Politically, they will no longer be under the domination of their enemies (Isa. 11:14); they will be the head and not the tail of the nations (Isa. 60:1-22); King Messiah will arbitrate the disputes of nations (Isa. 2:1-4) with the absence of war; faithful leaders will be granted them (Jer. 23:4); and the Davidic dynasty will be restored in unparalleled splendor (Hos. 3:4, 5; Amos 9:11; and Ezek. 37:22-25).

Above all, Israel will be transformed and transfigured spiritually as the spiritual leader of the nations. As has been stated, they will be redeemed (Isa. 60:21; 62:1-12); they will be witnesses to the nations (Zech. 8:8, 20-23); God's sanctuary will be in Jerusalem (Ezek. 37:26 and Mal. 3:3, 4); the Spirit will be poured out upon them (Joel 2:28, 29); and Jerusalem will be God's throne (Jer. 3:17). What a glorious prospect indeed!

From Genesis 12:1 through Malachi and large segments of the New Testament, Scripture relates to Israel directly or indirectly. Prophecy has largely to do with earth, so Israel as a people of earth has a large place in it. Let us remember Psalm 102:13; pray the prayer of Isaiah 62:6, 7; and realize the soul prosperity of Psalm 122:6. Blessed forever more be the Lord God of Israel!

GOD'S MESSAGE TO MAN THROUGH THE PROPHETS

III. THE PROPHETIC WORD AND THE NATIONS

CHARLES L. FEINBERG

The second chapter in Daniel has well been called the alphabet of prophecy. He who would have any understanding of the prophetic Scriptures, must come to this portion for the broad outlines of God's future program for the nations, for Israel, and for the glorious kingdom of Messiah. The sketch presented in this chapter is simple but most comprehensive. It is the framework for a multitude of future events. Its importance cannot be over-estimated. Strangely enough, the picture of events is given in the form of a dream, and that to a pagan king. Nebuchadnezzar was in this hour the ruler of most of the civilized world and much of the barbarian world as well. Though he may not have exercised actual sway over all this area, yet God had given him right and title over all the nations. This sovereignty had been granted Nebuchadnezzar because God had displaced the rule of His people Israel in the earth. Such was the consequence of their many years of backsliding and departure from the revealed will of God. As we have seen, this was the beginning of the times of the Gentiles, spoken of by the Lord Jesus Christ in Luke 21:24.

At the time of the first invasion of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar he was not the emperor, but ruled as a subordinate with his father, Nabopolassar. When this chapter commences, he had been sole ruler for two years. The dream consisted of several parts, so it is referred to in the plural. The king, the most powerful ruler of the day, had doubtless given much thought to the course of his rule, and had probably wondered often what the outcome of his reign would be. Thoughtful men and women know they cannot remain on earth forever, so they are concerned about what the future holds. God's Word alone holds the key to the events of time and eternity. It is important to remark here that it was not to Daniel but to Nebuchadnezzar, the first representative of world power and rule outside of Israel, that God disclosed at the start of the times of the Gentiles, the final doom of the first kingdom and those which were to follow until the kingdom of the Lord was realized on earth. Because Nebuchadnezzar was a heathen, and did not have the Scriptures of the Jews, he was communicated with by God in dreams, as God had done with Abimelech (Genesis 20) and Pharaoh (Genesis 41). Unlike Pharaoh who remembered his dream, Nebuchadnezzar had forgotten his, probably from fright. The heathen attached much importance to dreams, but it was to be an Israelite who would ultimately give its interpretation.

Having forgotten the dream and concerned over its meaning, the king turned naturally to his learned men. He consulted his magicians, astrologers (those who made their incantations with mutterings and whisperings), the sorcerers and probably the priests who are designated as Chaldeans. The king was frank to admit that his dream had gone from him. Some have questioned that the king really forgot the dream; they think this was his method of testing his learned men. It appears more plausible that he had actually forgotten it through the strange nature of the dream. The dream was so solemn and foreboding, that on awakening he had only the recollection of something startling in the dream, but the details were blacked out of his memory. He was master of a vast realm, but he was also aware that to the north there was a growing and threatening power of the Medes. If he had a foreboding of disaster,

this could have formed the basis of the dream which God used to outline the future of Gentile rule on earth in the centuries that lay ahead.

At this point in the original text the language changes from the Hebrew to the Aramaic, and that appropriately. The content of the dream will concern the Gentile world, so the language is a Gentile one to be the medium of the disclosure. The language is Aramaic through chapter 7. When the prophecies touch the Jews and Jerusalem, the language is Hebrew. Charlatans and quacks that they were, the wise men asked for the dream to be given them to manipulate according to their cunning ways.

The king's answer was immediate, promising them swift and summary judgment for non-compliance with his urgent request. When men pretend to supernatural knowledge which they do not have, they are apt to bring on themselves their own punishment. The threat of being cut to pieces was not an idle one. This form of punishment, called dichotomy, was not an uncommon one. If it be doubted that Nebuchadnezzar would carry out such cruel punishment, one has only to remember the judgment he meted out on poor, wicked Zedekiah. He slew the king's nobles first, then the princes of the realm, then blinded the king, after which he was placed in fetters.

According to the workings of Babylonian sorcery, it was not unreasonable for them to request the king to inform them of the details of his dream. But they were asking for that which the king could not give. By this time there may have been doubts in his mind as to their ability and truthfulness. Nebuchadnezzar surmised that they were parrying for time, and hoped to postpone the matter until the king was in a better mood or in a frame of mind to let the entire subject pass. It might be possible, too, to get the dream from him in a more favorable hour.

Now God makes these heathen to condemn their own helplessness out of their own mouths, in order that He may show by vivid contrast how He can reveal His secret to His servants, though they are but men on the earth. Their argument was that, since this type of request had never been made by a king of his wise men, it was not reasonable to expect this of them. The fact that it had not been done was their evidence that it could not be done. There was no precedent in the matter. The magicians referred to the supreme gods of the Babylonians who alone were supposed to be able to solve such difficulties as confronted them. But, alas, these gods had no contact with man and did not communicate with him. Thus the matter was without the range of the human and natural. They should not be expected to know it.

Evidently Daniel was unaware of the matter till now, so he asks of the king a grant of time with the assurance that there will be an interpretation forthcoming. The reason the king granted him time when he would not give it to the wise men was that the king already was convinced of the lying of the Chaldeans when they tried to wring from him the dream before they would interpret it. Daniel made no such empty stipulation. The God who would and could give the interpretation of the dream, could also recover the dream which Nebuchadnezzar had lost. We have seen the failure and terror of the magicians. There was no power in them to answer the king. But mark the attitude of Daniel and his resource in prayer to God.

A sailor in a shipwreck was once thrown upon a small rock, and clung to it in great danger until the tide went down. "Say, Jim," asked his friends after he was rescued, "didn't you shake with fear when you were hanging on that rock?" "Yes; but the rock didn't," was the significant answer. So when we trust God, there is no need to fear, though we may have cause in ourselves to do so. Throughout the record the faith of Daniel and his humility are beautifully set forth.

In his statement Daniel gives a general hint that the dream of the king has to do with changes and successions of kingdoms. The trials of empires, with their times and seasons, are not a matter of fate or accident, as the pagan thought, but are determined by God. The very events that take place at different periods of world history are ordered of God. History is truly, as has often been said, His story. Sovereignly God can and does remove kings; power and rule are definitely delegated of God (Rom. 13:1-4). As with Solomon, the Lord gives wisdom to the wise. To him that hath it shall be given, said our Lord Jesus.

The intention of God in the dream was to disclose to Nebuchadnezzar the things that would transpire in the latter days. This is an expression which refers to the whole future including the days of the Messiah in the final period of history, before the eternal state. The future centuries were to be unveiled before the king. What a dream it was too! No dream before it nor since has revealed so much nor so great a span of world history, running, as it did, from the hour then present to the end of time on earth.

Have you ever wondered why the dream was given the king in the form of a colossal image? The figures and symbols of the Bible are exact, and they cannot be interchanged without doing harm to the intent of the sacred writer and indicting the Holy Spirit behind the human penman. The reason the figure of a man is set forth here is because God wanted to make known what would transpire during man's day, in the ages when man was holding sway and having his way in the earth. By the image the entire gamut of man's world rule is brought before us in one panoramic view, from start to finish.

After the Babylonian empire which ended with the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, another kingdom would arise which was to be inferior to Babylon. The Medo-Persian empire is the second as can be seen from the Book of Daniel itself (5:28, 8:20). Was this kingdom inferior politically to the first? Indeed, it was. Nebuchadnezzar ruled as an autocratic monarch. In Medo-Persia the power of the central government was limited by the increasing strength of the nobles and the growing independence of the provinces. Nebuchadnezzar's word was law and could not be questioned; but Darius the Mede was frustrated by the insistent demands of the nobles. The third kingdom was that of Greece under Alexander the Great which put an end to the Persian rule. It did have dominion over all the earth.

The fourth kingdom is the Roman which was in power when the Lord Jesus came to earth. In the time of this kingdom the Son of God was crucified, a method of execution known to this kingdom. After the crucifixion of Christ the Roman empire continued to exist for about five centuries, after it had been divided into East Roman and West Roman. All know how faithfully history has followed this prewritten outline of world empires. Nebuchadnezzar began the times of the Gentiles in 606-586 B.C. The Persian empire carried them on in 536 B.C.

The Grecian kingdom took the scene in 330 B.C. and in 65 B.C. came the Roman. Do not overlook the fact that these kingdoms, except the first, were not on the scene of history. Daniel could not have guessed his way down through so many centuries.

It is noteworthy that the metals of the image deteriorate. World rule does not advance and go upward, as some fondly think, but goes downward. In the Roman there is a mingling of iron and clay--two extremes, signifying in the first case strength and in the second weakness. That empire has shown a strange blending of imperialistic tendencies with democratic elements. When the stone strikes this image, it is broken in pieces. That which seems so stable and lasting in the eyes of men, will not stand in the day that God visits world monarchies with His wrath. We must not overlook the fact that the last kingdom has more than one form: there are the two-stage form and then the tenfold arrangement. This latter set-up has never been witnessed on earth, even to this hour. This can only mean that the Roman empire, long since in a period of decline and abeyance, has not fully run its prescribed course in world affairs. The ten toes (as we shall see more fully in chapter 7) are ten kings who bear rule at the same time, forming a confederated empire on the area of the old empire. The many diverse elements that made up the Roman Empire of old cannot be made to answer to the simultaneous reign of ten kings. If this view is held, what event will stand for the falling of the stone upon the image and grinding all to power before it is driven away by the wind as the chaff of the summer threshing-floors?

The stone which fell from heaven cannot be made to speak of the birth of Christ into the world, nor of the peaceful spread of His gospel. The coming of Christ into the world at Bethlehem cannot be made to mean a catastrophe like the smiting of the image with the stone. In the first coming Christ did not put an end to the Roman Empire, but the world power joined with the religious leaders of the day to put Him to death. The peaceful propagation of the gospel has nothing in common with the stone falling from heaven and crushing man's world dominion. We do not know, nor are we authorized by Scripture to say just when the final cataclysm will strike.

What of the relation of the nations of earth to this stone? After all, this is the primary concern of our passage in Daniel. It is the distinct testimony of the Word of God that the unbelieving nations will continue on in their rejection of the grace of God in Christ, until they are finally ready for judgment from which there will be no remedy (Matt. 21:44). The world system will be crushed by Christ and ground to powder; it will be so broken to pieces that it will be driven away as the chaff is on the summer threshing-floors. It was the custom in Palestine and in the Orient to winnow wheat on a high place. When thrown into the air, the light chaff was carried off with the wind, while the wheat fell to the ground and remained for the benefit of the farmer.

But when is the time of the fall of the stone? No one can say exactly, but there must precede the catastrophe the formation of a ten-kingdom confederation on the territory of the ancient Roman Empire. This coalition will have a supreme head, and he is presented to us in chapter 7 of this book as the little horn coming up from the Roman Empire. It is a political leader of great power and attractiveness. It is well to remember these Scriptures as we read in our papers and magazines and hear on our radios of the many attempts to further and

bringing about universal and lasting peace. These efforts, when well-intentioned, are commendable and every heart will acquiesce in the desire that men shall be refrained from mortal conflict in any measure humanly possible. But God has indicated that ultimately peace must come through the personal activity of the Prince of Peace, the Lord Jesus Christ. But before He establishes peace on the earth, there must be a final reckoning with the nations who have turned from God.

There are some who are ready to deny that there could be such a thing as the reformation or renewal or revival of the old Roman Empire. It is quite evident that European thought is moving more and more along the lines of some counteragent to the increasing power and strength of the northern colossus of Russian Communism. Actually, the balance of power will be more than difficult to maintain in Europe or in the world for that matter, until there is a balancing force set against the rapacious beast of the north. How soon that coalition will come to realization it is foolhardy to say. Before these events fully head up in the end times, the Church which is the Body of Christ will have been caught away to heaven as the Lord promised (John 14:1-3; I Thess. 4:13-18). All believers now will be gone to be with the Lord before these final events are realized on earth. Let us be zealous to keep the broad outlines of what God has prophetically given, in their proper order and proper place.

The king could not help but be impressed by the wisdom the Lord had given. God had actually outlined world power from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar until the coming reign of the Lord Jesus Christ. Significantly enough, this chapter closes with Nebuchadnezzar down on his face before Daniel. This is but a faint foreshadowing of the way the world powers in a coming day will have to make obeisance to the greater than Daniel, that is, to the Lord Jesus Christ.

GOD'S MESSAGE TO MAN THROUGH THE PROPHETS

IV. THE PROPHETIC WORD AND THE CHURCH

CHARLES L. FEINBERG

Prophecy concerning the Church is to be found only in the New Testament. Types and illustrations of the Church are readily seen in the Old Testament, but the Body of Christ is not a subject of Old Testament prophetic revelation. See Matt. 16:18. The New Testament, which discloses truth concerning the origin, the constituency, the privileges, the warfare, the service, and the responsibilities of the Church, also foretells the events which consummate her history. Let us consider the next event in God's prophetic plan for the Body of Christ. It is rightly called the rapture of the Church. By the term Church we mean that body of individuals who have placed faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as Savior and Redeemer from sin in this age of grace. The catching up or rapture of the Church is taught in a number of New Testament passages. So clear is this teaching that we maintain that without a proper understanding of it, the entire Scriptural doctrine of the Church will be and must be misunderstood.

THE PROPHECIES OF THE RAPTURE

We take them not in the order of their original proclamation, but as they are found in our Bibles.

John 14:1-3

The following three points should be observed in this passage. First, the depression of the disciples (v. 1). Second, the preparation of Christ (v. 2). The Father's house is heaven, and not the temple on earth. The ark went before Israel in the wilderness to search them out a resting-place (Num. 10:33). So Christ has gone on for us. Third, the return of Christ (v. 3).

I Corinthians 15:50-58

First, the divine principle (50, 53). The kingdom in glory is meant here. No need in this body for renewal as does a body with blood. Flesh and blood are suited to the earthly sphere and not the heavenly. Paul has answered two questions (v. 35): (1) How are the dead raised up? It is only a sowing and there will be a harvest. (2) What kind of a body do they have? A body like Christ's. Now the question is raised: What will happen to the body of believers alive when the Lord comes? This passage is the answer and it is the rapture.

Second, the mystery (51, 52). (1) the change, (2) the time: (a) in a moment, (b) in the twinkling of an eye, (c) at the last trump. Third, the fulfilment of all Old Testament prophecies (v. 54). See Isa. 25:8, where the prophet is speaking of death by the Assyrian.

Fourth, the victory of Christ (55-57). The serpent, death, has lost its poison, specifically in the rapture. Fifth, the practical purpose of the truth (v. 58). No need to remain in skepticism and doubt. Does this truth make us lazy? Hear the words: "always abounding in the work of the Lord." And the labor is not in vain as though there were no resurrection.

I Thessalonians 4:13-18

First, the cause of this disclosure, (v. 13). Second, the comparison in this disclosure (v. 14). The verse teaches that just as Christ died and rose again, so will all His own also. Ellicott says: "The if here obviously involves no element of doubt, but is simply logical and virtually assertory." Equivalent here to since. Notice Jesus died, but believers have fallen asleep. He tasted all the bitterness of death. Bring with him--the very thing the Thessalonians feared would not happen to their loved ones. Third, the confirmation of the disclosure (v. 15a).

Fourth, the content of the disclosure (15b-17). v. 15--to allay their fears with regard to the dead. "The Lord Himself"--not through any angel, archangel, cherub, seraph, or man. God in His grace used Abraham to found a nation, Moses to lead a people out of bondage, Joshua to conquer a land and settle that nation, David and Solomon to rule this people. But in the rapture of His own the Lord delegates this to no one. "Shall descend from heaven"--He did ascend and has been seated at the right hand of the Father these many centuries. "Shout"--that of a commander to his followers (term is a military one). It will be grander far than that which brought Jericho's walls tumbling down (Josh. 6:16ff). "The voice"--that voice of the mighty leader of all the angelic hosts, above angels, cherubim, and seraphim. "The trump"--Num. 10:4--more mighty than the trumpets of Gideon (Judg. 7:19ff). Then there will be union (or better reunion and recognition), "together with them"--hama sun. No introductions in heaven. Fifth, the comfort of the disclosure (v. 18). A Christian visitor was once visiting a very poor and sorely afflicted believer in Dublin, and tried to comfort him with the text, "In my Father's house are many mansions." "Stop a minute," said the dying but happy sufferer, "that is a beautiful text, but there is one sweeter than it in the next verse: 'I will come again, and receive you unto myself.'"

THE PROGRAM OF THE RAPTURE

From the passages already treated and others, we understand that the rapture will be:

Before the Great Tribulation. It will not be post-tribulation nor mid-tribulation. This can be seen from two vital facts:

The nature of the Church's hope. Phil. 3:20, 21; I Thess. 1:9, 10; Tit. 2:13; I Thess. 4:13-18. The hope of believers is not long life nor painless death nor wealth nor world conversion, but the coming of the Lord. It is no bright hope if the Tribulation must intervene. The Epistles, which speak of every phase of Christian life, do not mention the Church's passing through this time (Rev. 3:10. Lot--Gen. 19:22).

The nature of Daniel's seventy weeks. They are a unit in their reference to Israel and cannot be torn apart (Dan. 9:24). If God deals in this period with Israel, then the Church is not a group on earth. The interpretation of the whole Book of Revelation hinges on the nature of Daniel's seventieth week, for such is its setting. If there is confusion here, the distinction between Israel and the Church is blurred (I Cor. 10:32). As long as the Church is on earth, no Jew or Gentile can accept Christ without entering immediately the Body of Christ. If a saved remnant of Israel is in Jerusalem (Matt. 24), and is still reckoned as of Israel, and if 144,000 (Rev. 7) are saved (the seal of God is theirs), then why are they still of Israel, and not designated of the Church, if the Church be on earth? If the Church were on earth, they would be a part of it.

In a moment. Not a long process like sanctification. Notice Enoch and Elijah. Not after some specified event. The Church is said to be timeless and signless. See Jas. 5:7. Some (that is, those who seek the revival of the apostolic gifts,) take this as another Pentecost. There are some events in Scripture that are so epoch-making as never to be repeated, such as the creation of man, the giving of the Mosaic Law, the incarnation, Gethsemane, Calvary, and Pentecost. What is meant by James is a figure from nature in Palestine. They have two rainy seasons, spring and fall. Dt. 11:14. The verse speaks not of one rain but of two. The text has no indication in it that one looks back and the other forward.

As a body. The Church will not be raptured in sections or parts--no partial rapture. There will be only two classes: dead saints and living saints. Eph. 5:25-27--a glorious Church, not a spotted or wrinkled one, let alone a mutilated one. Heb. 9:28; The expression may apply to the deliverance of the Jews who wait for Him in the last days. He will appear for their deliverance. Thus it is applicable to the Jewish remnant in the last days. Note the character of the Epistle with its assumption of an unsaved nucleus as well as a saved portion in Israel, now forming the Church.

Accompanied by the giving of rewards to the saints of this age. 2 Cor. 5:1-10; 2 Tim. 4:8. This will be the time of the judgment of Christ (on the works of Christians) at the Bema.

Marriage Supper of the Lamb. Rev. 19:1-9. This is the hour in history to consummate the eternal relationship between Christ and His Bride. 2 Cor. 11:2; Eph. 5:25ff.

Return to earth. Rev. 19:11-16; 2 Thess. 1:3-10.

Reign with the King. 2 Tim. 2:11-13; Rev. 11:15-18; 20:6.

THE PRACTICAL VALUE OF THE RAPTURE

Many assert that belief in the blessed hope is a detriment to Christian life and service. They say it leads to pessimism. They need to be reminded that you can't be optimistic with a misty optic. The Spirit of God must have considered otherwise, for He relates it in the New Testament to practically every exhortation whether it be to watchfulness, moderation, patience, practical sanctification, faithfulness in service, purity, endurance in trials, brotherly love, separation from worldly lusts in this life, consolation in time of bereavement, and many others. Above all, it keeps our eyes in the right direction--looking for the Lord!

When Shackleton was driven back from his quest of the South Pole, he left his men on Elephant Island, and promised to come back to them. Working his way as best he could to South Georgia, he tried to get back to fulfill his promise, and failed; tried again and failed. The ice was between him and the island; he was not able to return, but he could not rest. Though the season was adverse, and they told him it was impossible, yet in his little boat he tried it again. It was the wrong time of year, but he got nearer the island; there was an open avenue between the sea and the place where he had left his men. He ran his boat in at the risk of being nipped, got all his men on board, and came out again before the ice crashed to. It was all done in half an hour. When the excitement was partly over, he turned to one of them and said, "Well, you were all packed and ready!" and the man said, "You see, boss, Wild (the second in command) never gave up hope, and whenever the sea was at all clear of ice, he rolled up his sleeping-bag, and said to all hands, 'Roll up your sleeping-bags, boys; the boss may come today.'" Such was the manner in which a dark, black outlook was suddenly changed, and they were all safe, homeward bound. Are we keeping our hope bright? It is based on a surer promise than ever man could make.

Believer, keep the hope warm and bright!

GENERAL REVIEW

Events viewed in the Light of God's Word

HERMAN A. HOYT

President, Grace Theological Seminary

At last an educator of some note assesses the trend in modern public school education and pronounces anathemas upon it. Before the 68th Congress of American Industry, sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers, Dr. Max Rafferty, Superintendent of Public Instruction in the State of California, delivered a notable address in New York City on December 6, 1963. U. S. News and World Report considered it sufficiently important to the American public to carry lengthy and revealing excerpts from this message.

Although the address may have covered a far wider area than is reported, the editors of U. S. News and World Report chose three points of emphasis in this message where present day educators are least likely to differ with current trends: the spiritual, the political, and the academic, in that order. Had it been a clergyman, a statesman, or an academician outside the field of professional education, this address might well have been in perspective. But the very fact that it is a professional educator weighing the worth of his own profession, and finding it wanting in important respects, should give pause to all who read it.

Heading the list are his remarks on the spiritual fortunes of present day public education. Here are some of his statements:

Public education, which was originally founded in our land to bulwark and interpret religion, is today forbidden to do anything of the sort.

. . . the use of the schools for sectarian religious purposes entered upon sharp and precipitate decline which has continued to this day, and which has brought us to the point where the singing of Christmas carols has come under attack, and graduation baccalaureate services have to be held off the high school campus.

The history of religion, the immeasurable cultural contribution to our heritage made by Judaeo-Christian tradition, the moral and ethical values of Western civilization, all these things can and should be taught to the children of America. They should be told, among other things, that this nation was first settled by persons with devoutly religious convictions, that our people were among the first to solve the age-old problem of permitting many differing religious groups to live peaceably side by side, and that no religious wars have ever sullied our American countryside.

From the viewpoint of one who is a student of the Scriptures, one might be inclined to differ with him on certain points, realizing that he confuses certain very vital issues; yet basically he is feeling after that quality which has been lost to public education in the exclusion of the supernatural. This loss he regards as a calamity which needs to be corrected

before it is too late.

The next point of emphasis is the political. He refers to it as "education for national survival," or in other words, love of country or patriotism. For advocating this he himself recently underwent sharp criticism in educational circles. But his convictions on this point are adamant. He admits that he may not know how to teach patriotism to children, though it seems to him that "telling them over and over again the wonderful tales from American history . . . familiarizing them so completely with the lives and personalities of our great heroes" may help to accomplish this task. Students can be shown "by word and by example that we, their instructors, believe profoundly in the mighty truths which these men and their contemporaries forged for us in the flaming crucible of suffering and self-sacrifice."

On the other hand, however, Dr. Rafferty is positive how not to teach patriotism. All one needs do is

Tell the children that our national heroes were not very heroic after all. Keep dwelling on Washington's temper, and Lincoln's poor table manners, and Ben Franklin's popularity with the ladies. Stress countless weaknesses to which all flesh is heir. Emphasize our labor strife and our racial problems and child labor 40 years ago and the trusts 40 years before that In this way, you will produce in the minds of the children a balanced, bland, tasteless, lifeless image of their country--and all in the name of objectivity.

In Dr. Rafferty's estimation this will be sure to produce a nation of men and women who will have little reason to defend what Americans have held sacred for generations. Even the education that has so dismally failed to teach children to preserve the nation will also be lost. Such nonsense as "teaching the subject versus teaching the child," "togetherness," "ingroupness," and "life adjustment" will be revealed for what they are in the midst of coming crisis unless educators face up to the facts of life.

Another paradox in the emphasis of Dr. Rafferty lies in the area of the academic. The image of the educator is at stake. Is he determined to be a mere technician or is the caption of learned scholar to be preferred? Preceding and immediately following the turn of the century teachers and even administrators were known and respected for their learning, and their tenure was often for life. But now tenure is decreased and administrators have shriveled to mere technicians. They know much about behavioristic psychology, acoustical tile, standard deviations, and dry-wall construction. They are fast-talking, fast-moving, and fast-changing from one place to another.

How different from the old-time administrator who was an object of universal respect. He had a grasp of the Latin language, knew intimately the original Greek of the *Illiad*, and could discuss intelligently Miltonic blank verse. Respect for him grew out of the fact that he was educated, and he retained his position for that reason. The cultural ambitions of the community gathered about him, and he provided inspiration for young and old alike. He was widely read, a man who had a grasp of general education, as well as concentration in some

special discipline.

The change came with the introduction of the philosophy of Dr. John Dewey into the educational field. Dr. Rafferty recognizes that this was not only devastating but also paralyzing.

Since the take-over of my profession 30 years ago by the burning-eyed, thin-lipped disciples of Dr. John Dewey, with their maddening and unshakable assurance that they alone were right and everybody else was not only wrong but slightly stupid, school people have been told by virtually everyone in authority over them that culture was of no consequence.

In such a Philistine environment, under superiors who consistently sneer at and deride the importance of cultural content, exposed solely to a philosophy which holds that there are no lasting values, no eternal verities, no positive standards, it's a living wonder that such a large number of our teachers and school administrators are as literate and cultured as they are.

In the considered judgment of this educator there is nothing so much needed today to restore the public school to its proper place in the American heritage as a change in the national educational philosophy. This means that content of knowledge is important; that some things are intrinsically important; that pragmatic values grow out of intrinsic worth. In Dr. Rafferty's language

We need to be told once again that the real purpose of education is to pursue the truth, and that in order to do this we must supply our children with the intellectual tools which the race has found to be indispensable.

To carry this observation to full fruition, the words of Solomon are in point, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge" (Prov. 1:7). The Lord Himself declared, "Thy word is truth" (Jn. 17:17), "And the truth shall make you free" (Jn. 8:32). To get back to the philosophy of education endorsed by our forefathers would be a start in the right direction. This means that the present trend in education which finally culminated in the decision of the Supreme Court to ban prayer and Bible reading from the classroom of tax-supported schools needs to be reversed; it means that the basic philosophy of education which made this nation great needs to be restored; it means that there needs to be a new dedication to the vital and unchanging verities of life if this nation conceived in recognition of the supernatural and determined to explore the benefits of divine beneficence for all shall long endure.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE PASTOR AND HIS WORK. By Homer A. Kent, Sr., Th.D. Moody Press, Chicago, 1963. 298 pp., \$4.50.

The Pastor and His Work comes from the pen and experience of Dr. Homer A. Kent, Sr., who for fifteen years was the pastor of the First Brethren Church in Washington, D. C., and for the past twenty-three years has been Professor of Practical Theology and Church History at Grace Theological Seminary. Both his pastoral and teaching ministries have adequately qualified him to write this volume in which he shares both his experience and his theory with his readers.

Dr. Kent divides his consideration of the pastoral ministry into four areas:

Part I, The Pastor and His Personal Affairs, deals with the pastor's personal life, his study, his books, his ethical conduct, and his wife. Each chapter is tinged with reality and contains many practical suggestions that will be beneficial to every reader.

The Pastor and His Public Ministry is the subject of Part II. In this section Dr. Kent discusses the Sunday morning worship service, the Sunday evening service, the midweek prayer meeting, the evangelistic meeting, the public invitation, the taking of confessions in the public service, administering baptism and communion, the dedication of infants, the wedding ceremony, the funeral, and the pastor's ministry as a public servant. Each chapter abounds with many ideas and will serve as a handbook to guide the reader as he seeks guidance in relation to each area.

The Pastor in His Administrative Relationships, Part III, discusses matters pertain-

ing to licensure, ordination, candidating, organizations of the church, the financial problem of the church, the Sunday School, and the "Seventy Group" (a group designed to develop the members of the church into soul winners). These subjects are all given adequate discussion. The first three chapters of this section would be particularly helpful to one seeking his first pastorate or to one who is counseling such a man.

The final section, Part IV, The Pastor and His Visitation and Counseling Opportunities, deals with the important subjects of pastoral visitation, sickroom visitation, and pastoral counseling. In dealing with pastoral visitation, Dr. Kent gives nine good reasons why the pastor should engage in such a program, then eight characteristics such a program should have, several suggestions as to how the visitation program can be organized, and concludes with setting forth some results that such a program will yield. It is refreshing to read such a re-emphasis upon an area of the pastoral ministry that is neglected and disparaged by many. Concerning sickroom visitation and pastoral counseling, Dr. Kent lists suggestions which will be of value to those seeking guidance in these areas.

Three other features increase the value of the book: (1) throughout its text the author suggests other texts which will be of value to one seeking further information in a given area, i.e., in the section on the pastor's library, books which should be included in a basic library are suggested; (2) all but three of the book's twenty-three chapters contain a bibliography of other works which one can consult if further research in a given area is desired; and (3) the book is scripturally ori-

ented. This last is perhaps the book's outstanding feature. The author continually refers to Scripture either to illustrate or to substantiate his points. This gives the book and the principles outlined therein an authority much higher than that of the author himself. It is indeed refreshing to read the work of a man who practically applies the teaching of Scripture to the ministry of the pastor rather than setting forth pious platitudes in the vacuum of human experience, divorced from scriptural authority.

Readers of the Grace Journal should find great profit from reading this book. It is the type of book that you will want to include in your library. You will want to refer to it often for guidance and suggestions in the various areas of pastoral work, particularly if you are new to the ministry or have men under your ministry who are planning to enter the ministry. By all means buy this book, read it, and refer to it often.

PAUL R. FINK

Grace Theological Seminary

THE IMPACT OF AMERICAN RELIGIOUS LIBERALISM. By Kenneth Cauthen. Harper and Row Publishers, New York, 1962. 290 pp., \$6.00.

Religious liberalism has a set of doubts or denials that all liberals hold more or less in common. Yet the individual pattern of beliefs and doubts varies considerably from man to man. This book provides a useful account of the systems of several leaders of the movement. A helpful concluding chapter deals with the present heirs of the liberal tradition.

The author distorts the truth by his own bias in favor of the movement. He endorses the assumption that liberalism is a version of

the Christian faith and grossly minimizes the gulf between naturalism and supernaturalism. Consistent with this, he calls fundamentalism, as a theological movement, a distinctly twentieth-century phenomenon. Yet he concedes that previous orthodoxy had rested on Biblical authoritarianism. It would have been refreshing if he had admitted that from orthodox Christianity almost the only things liberalism took were its vocabulary, its institutions and its endowments.

To liberals, a great value of such a book as this is in the way it glosses over the ethical problem in their past. Liberals took the denominations, schools and pulpits by stealth, representing themselves as Christians and cloaking their anti-Biblical concepts in evangelical language. This book helps preserve that cloak.

ROBERT DELNAY

Central Conservative Baptist
Theological Seminary

THE MODERNS. By William C. Fletcher. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids 6, Michigan, 1962. 160 pp., \$3.00.

Here in popular, readable language is a guide to several leading figures behind the current theological scene. The first section treats Schleiermacher, Ritschl, and Har-nack, with certain of their followers, as outstanding among the founders of liberalism and modernism. The second section deals with neo-orthodoxy, especially as it is to be seen in Kierkegaard, Tillich, Barth and Bultmann. If the individual summaries may seem overly brief, this very brevity will render the book useful to many.

A particular value is the observation that the antagonisms between neo-orthodoxy

and liberalism are not as deep as it might appear. The new theologians may, in their view, be correcting or disavowing the old, but both schools have a very great deal in common.

ROBERT DELNAY

Central Conservative Baptist
Theological Seminary

ADVANCING THE SMALLER LOCAL CHURCH. By W. Curry Mavis. Light and Life Press, Winona Lake, Indiana, 1957. 179 pp., \$3.00.

There is no "magic" formula to bring spiritual and numerical growth to the smaller local church (a group with less than 150 people). However, the author of this work sets forth a practical and realistic program for its advancement. Professor of Pastoral Work at Asbury Theological Seminary and Editor of The Church Minister, Dr. Mavis firmly believes in the need and the success of the smaller church. The spiritual, sociological, and psychological problems of the smaller churches are both a challenge and a discouragement. The author states and analyzes the problems, then suggests solutions to these stubborn areas. Discouraged pastors and complacent church leaders should be awakened to their opportunities in "face-to-face" fellowship. The smaller church needs a purposive and productive activity, plus a "success-mindedness." The door of evangelism is unlocked by "person-mindedness." First comes the personal evangelism of the pastor of his people, then follows the touch of the people with their neighbors. The church which lacks a burden for its area is a failure.

Dr. Mavis handles well the acute problems of getting people to accept responsibility, maintaining morale, and obtaining necessary finances for programs. The following

sections are considered especially helpful: (1) the pastor's care of his flock on pages 129-141; (2) the primacy of preaching on pages 150-156; (3) organization and conduction of visitation on pages 169-174; (4) instruction on revival services on pages 174-179; (5) a chart to rate the church in the six major areas of organization, stewardship-finance, public relations-publicity, worship, Christian education, and evangelism on the unnumbered pages of the Appendix.

Having a profitable content marked off in good divisions, this book will serve as a ready reference for the pastors and leaders in the smaller local church.

JAMES H. GABHART

Union Gospel Church
Waterloo, Iowa

EXPOSITORY PREACHING WITHOUT NOTES. By Charles W. Koller, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1962. 132 pp., \$2.50.

This book represents a new effort to present a very strategic subject in a minister's life in interesting and intelligible language. Homiletics is explained by example, rather than definition alone, and provides a refresher for men already in the field. It can be easily adapted for a classroom textbook, having been the result of classroom presentation over many years at Northern Baptist Seminary.

The entire book is a veritable gold mine of treasured instruction and advice for men interested in forceful, Bible-centered preaching. Expository preaching is not considered as a "form" but as a "method" in presenting the Word. His outlook toward the importance of a good homiletical knowledge

is stated in these words: "but in order to be well received, the sermon must have unity, structure, aim and progression; it must be sustained by Biblical authority, and must be intelligently presented."

The perennial problem of attempting to reconcile the primary need for content with the means to communicate that content is well handled by this author. He clearly shows that a harmony between the two is absolutely necessary if there is to be the presentation of sermons that will grip the people and cause them to act upon what they hear. He emphasizes that mere memory of a manuscript is not the secret to proper delivery of a vital, living message.

The content of his book would have been suggested better had it been entitled, "Expository Preaching Without Manuscripts." For an up-to-date, concise study and survey of the ministry of good preaching this book is well recommended.

MILTON WM. JONES

Portland, Oregon

THE TREASURY OF RELIGIOUS VERSE.
Compiled by Donald T. Kauffman. Fleming
H. Revell Company, Westwood, New Jersey,
1962. 371 pp., \$4.95.

Rev. Donald T. Kauffman, managing editor of the Fleming H. Revell Company, has compiled 600 religious selections from almost 300 poetic authors and sources. His selections range from the Chippewa Indians to Benjamin Franklin, and from William Shakespeare to Annie Johnson Flint. There are contributions from the old poetic masters as Browning, Tennyson, and Cowper, and from the contemporary lyricists as Robert Frost, Carl Sandberg, and T. S. Eliot. The diffi-

culty of the compiler's task is worthy of note, because some of the selections are from authors not considered primarily as poets of religious thought, for example, Bliss Carman. Although the Contents includes five major headings with thirty-three interspersed topics, the outstanding feature of this work is four comprehensive indexes: (1) Titles and First Lines; (2) Subjects (over 140 listings); (3) Authors; (4) Special Days and Occasions (over 50 listings).

Some readers will be disappointed in the small number of verses taken from favorites as Fanny Crosby, John and Charles Wesley. There are no contributions gathered from the works of A. B. Simpson, Oswald J. Smith, or H. H. Savage. On the back flap of the publisher's jacket John Bunyan is advertised as a contributing author. However, only one short selection of three stanzas is taken from his writings. A few recognized Roman Catholics have some of their works included: Loyola (founder of the Jesuits); Teresa (founder of the Discalced Carmelites); Bernard of Clairvaux (reputed founder of the Knights Templar). Kauffman sprinkles several Biblical portions among the religious verses. But the minister who makes the Word of God central in his service will be disappointed with the meager poetic selections on the Bible. There are more poems listed for Labor Day and Brotherhood Week than for Easter and the Cross. Works on the Rapture, the Second Coming, and the Kingdom are very noticeable by their absence. Except for the poem "We Are Living, We Are Dwelling" by Arthur C. Coxe (pp. 301, 302), there are no selections on missions or evangelism. There is only one poem listed for New Year's Day (p. 302) and one on the Jews (p. 69). The presentations on sin and salvation lack the strong impact to bring action or a clear-cut decision for Christ. This reviewer misses listings or selections on

the following: assurance, confession, consecration, forgiveness, heaven, perseverance, promise, punishment, redemption (atone-ment), resurrection of the saints, soul-winning, temperance, warnings, and wrath.

Attractively bound, this anthology would be very acceptable for public and school libraries. Although limited in its scope of service, this volume will be good source material for writers and public speakers.

JAMES H. GABHART

Union Gospel Church
Waterloo, Iowa

THE CHURCH AT WORSHIP. By Bernard Schalm. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1962. 108 pp., \$1.95.

The purpose of this book is to aid ministers, musicians, and laymen in the enrichment of the Worship Hour and to make this hour more meaningful and inspirational to the worshipper. The Head of the New Testament Department at the Christian Training Institute at Edmonton, Canada, Bernard Schalm, decries the thought of returning to the emotional, spontaneous type of service of the last century. He would keep step with those who desire to return to the liturgical and more orderly form of worship service. He believes that each denomination should make a re-examination of its foundation in the light of the Word of God. Sociological environment should not be the deciding factor as to the form and order in worship; but theology should be the final authority in the acceptance and rejection of such form and order. Only by a recovery of the theological significance of Christian worship can the Church become the God-planned revolutionary force in the lives of individuals and in society as a whole.

The author divides his thirteen chapters

into two parts, history of worship (chapters 1-3) and the practical side of worship (4-13). In chapter one Mr. Schalm traces the origination of the English word "worship" back to the old Anglo-Saxon root meaning "worth-ship." He then notes that true worship springs from the recognition and acknowledgment of the "worth-ship" of God. Worship is not a series of acts or rituals--lots of motion--but proper reverence, respect, and love for God.

In early Christianity (as discussed in chapters 2-4) worship was an integral part of the believer's life. His honor to the Father was a natural result of the new sonship in God through Christ. Mr. Schalm concludes that our worship should be as theirs, a fresh, enthusiastic devotion to God. It should overflow from the abundant life in Christ Jesus. To properly worship God, man must prepare his body, his soul, and the house of worship prior to the Sunday service!

In the very helpful portions of this work (chapters 6-11), the author discusses the use of prayer, music, offering, the Bible, baptism, and communion in worship. He briefly and interestingly sketches the history of each of the above, and then he broadly outlines how to make each part meaningful to the worshipper. He notes that methods of worship must be re-examined by each generation and adjusted to the mode or character of the time. In that the author deals with controversial issues, some readers will disagree with his conclusions (e.g., his relegation of gospel songs to the home, pp. 54-56). However, the usefulness of his material far outweighs any irritation which might arise from disagreement. For the alert minister, the author supplies several good sermon outlines (e.g., the seven-fold meaning of communion to the worshipper, pp. 94-96). This book is a part of the new Minis-

ter's Handbook Series from Baker Book House.

Since there is a dearth of books on the subject of worship, especially the practical aspects, the reviewer welcomes and recommends this work.

JAMES H. GABHART

Union Gospel Church
Waterloo, Iowa

INDEPENDENT BIBLE STUDY. By Irving L. Jensen. Moody Press, Chicago, 1963. 188 pp., \$3.50.

This book is not for a lazy Bible student! He who carefully follows the instructions of this book will undoubtedly be able to analyze his Bible. Dr. Irving L. Jensen, Chairman of the Bible Department at Bryan College, Dayton, Tennessee, encourages people to discover, enjoy, and share the truths of God's Word. In his five chapters with more than twenty charts and illustrations, the author explains Bible study by the inductive method and the analytical chart. By "independent" Bible study, the author does not mean an original study with an attitude of self-sufficiency apart from the guidance of the Holy Spirit. But rather his program calls for study of a first-hand character and a personal striving to grow spiritually. He recommends that the students should carefully examine the text, seek its meaning, and make a practical application. The three eyes of the student are the Holy Spirit, the physical eye, and a pencil.

Chapters one and two, "The Bible as Literature" and "The Inductive Method of Study," respectively, are interestingly and intellectually presented. The average layman would have neither the background to grasp nor the interest to pursue this study. A pastor could digest the material and present it in a con-

densed, simpler form. The author's discussion of the student and his necessary equipment (chapter 3) is enlightening. Because of its accuracy and clear paragraph divisions, Dr. Jensen recommends the American Standard Version (ASV) as the basic study Bible. He briefly states the benefits of each of the other translations or versions which he recommends. Some readers will disagree with Dr. Jensen's employment of the Revised Standard Version (RSV) without a danger signal being raised (p. 99). There are many pastors, teachers, and students who feel that the RSV is clouded with untenable theological presuppositions. For his benefit, the author might have chosen another passage to criticize in the New English Bible than II Timothy 3:16 (pp. 162, 163), because the rendering of this passage in his chosen ASV is as glittering and disappointing in error.

The last two chapters of the book explain the construction and practical uses of the analytical chart. The author ushers the reader through steps of preliminary operation (e.g., choice of a paragraph title), main topical study, textual re-creation, supplementary studies, interpretation and application. Without a doubt the greatest values in analysis are personal benefit and then impartation to others. In addition to the Table of Contents, the author has prepared a list of charts and illustrations (p. 13), two appendixes (pp. 167-178), a glossary (pp. 179-181), bibliography (pp. 183-186), and a general index (pp. 187, 188). Students of Bible schools, colleges, and seminaries will find a rewarding experience in this study method.

JAMES H. GABHART

Union Gospel Church
Waterloo, Iowa

FOCUS. By Anna J. Lindgren. Moody Press, Chicago, reprinted 1962. 153 pp., \$2.95.

Esther Winge, a Swedish immigrant girl, shares her thoughts, emotions, and activities as she seeks for the ultimate meaning of life. Her story, unraveled in a personal diary, travels through introspection, philosophy, and materialism to Christ. She searches for the highest good in unions, the labor movement, social service, friendship, and love. Finally, her focus sets on the satisfying reality, the Bread of Life.

Focus was a Swedish best seller in the early thirties and was published under the title Esther Winge. A former Swedish school teacher, Miss Lindgren came to America at the turn of the century, accepted Christ under the ministry of Dr. John Timothy Stone, and taught several years in the Swedish Department of Moody Bible Institute. It is suggested that many of Miss Lindgren's inner thoughts and struggling emotions are revealed in the character of Esther Winge. One sentence of the story appears to be unfinished, "Your code of ethics is a social" (p. 127, line 2). The author demonstrates a wide interest in secular literature. This book will appeal especially to college-level adults.

JAMES H. GABHART

Union Gospel Church
Waterloo, Iowa

BIBLE TREASURES. By Ivor Powell. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, American Edition 1960. 182 pp., \$2.50.

Evangelist Ivor Powell, widely known as "The Man from Wales," is a master with the pictorial pen. By means of choice, eloquent language, he makes Bible characters and stories come alive. The pointed lessons of Bible

truths are pressed home in a refreshing, delightful way. His eighty-two sketches range from Adam to the Lamb of the Apocalypse. Each sketch is composed of an outline divided into three to eight parts and the whole sketch is treated in two pages. Many excellent sermons, Sunday School lessons, and talks could be built on these sketches. The adaptability of the material is believed to be the best feature of this book. Because of his striking, almost tantalizing, sketch titles, Powell will cause many to read the whole book at one sitting. Examples of his excellent titles are "Joseph . . . whose funeral lasted 450 years," "The Gardener . . . who neglected his weeding," and "Four Midgets . . . and their secret of strength." Throughout the book, source Scriptures are noted beneath each title on its respective page. The Index is an alphabetical listing of abbreviated sketch titles (pp. 165, 166). Another aid for the reader is a combined and comprehensive Bible index to cover Powell's trilogy, Bible Cameos, Bible Pinnacles, and Bible Treasures (pp. 167-182). For the sake of variety, interest, and profit, Powell deals with some characters of lesser note (e.g., Barzillai, Jabez), treats some sketches as personal letters (e.g., "Dear Mr. Inn-Keeper," p. 103), and utilizes illustrations (e.g., Josephus's identification of the widow sustained by Elisha as being the wife of Obadiah, pp. 33, 34). Feasting on expressions or phrases as "scintillating gems," standing "respondent," a storm that "swirled around his soul," and a slave who "absconded from his master," the reader is drawn into a most picturesque pageantry. Powell's alliterations are unexcelled.

Perhaps the author raises more problems than can be solved by the following criticisms of the Apostle Paul: (1) Paul and Barnabas's dissension over John Mark was a "foolish quarrel" and sinful on the part of

both apostles (pp. 129, 130). (2) Paul was regretful and frustrated when he failed to preach the cross on Mars Hill, but he corrected this error at Corinth by preaching nothing "save Jesus Christ, and him crucified" (pp. 131, 132). (3) Paul should have remained in his calling to the Gentiles, instead of continually causing himself trouble by an insistence to preach to the Jews also (pp. 133, 134).

This book will enjoy a wide circulation among the believers. A spiritual blessing awaits the attentive reader.

JAMES H. GABHART

Union Gospel Church
Waterloo, Iowa

THE NEW CREATION AS METROPOLIS. By Gibson Winter. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1963. 152 pp., \$3.95.

This book will evoke deep thought in the minds of the readers, but it is not the answer to the sociological, economical, and spiritual problems of our country or the world. Associate Professor of Ethics and Society at the Divinity School of the University of Chicago and a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Gibson Winter designs the Church's task in an urban world. The Church must acknowledge the metropolis as the basic unit of society and produce disciplined lay communities of life and theological reflection to live out her saving history. When the metropolitan area mushroomed by industrialization, the changing communities moved out of the control of the pastors. The Church is presently isolated from the moving forces of society. It is time for the Church to redefine religious situations, reconsider the platforms for her religious operation, and reconceive her religious activities. Private, independent interests must give place to interdependence. Oneness of mankind must be created out of the

chaos of races and classes in the urban area. The lay Servanthood, theologically self-conscious and socially alert, must be the instruments to bring about a unified, interdependent, reconciled society (metropolis).

Dr. Winter takes great pains to depreciate the Billy Graham movement (pp. 13-20, 31). Apparently to the author, Billy Graham represents the Pietistic movement or the fundamental core which has persisted since the Reformation. The Graham crusades are credited with limited and incomplete stress on individual conversion and subjective decisions. Christianity has been reduced to mere subjective feeling. Pietism with individual salvation opposes the servant Church or the Christianity of the age to come. The Pietistic movement causes division of energy and resource, distorts the meaning of the Gospel and the nature of the Church, and distracts Christianity from its true task. The author further states that the Church is not here to cultivate emotions or moral integrity of its members. The gospel of yesterday is no longer sufficient for the trials and testings of today. Stewardship in the Church is nothing more than a fund raising "gimmick."

Under the proposal of the author, the laity are to become the prophetic fellowship which must get men to reflect upon their responsibility for shaping the future. The only commitment of the laity would be to the New Mankind. The Eucharist event (I Cor. 11) would be primarily the embodiment of the New Mankind within the community, and it would show forth the risen Body, and this Body is to be discerned in the New Mankind. The Church cannot have a suprahistory, but she must be a partner with Christ in construction of the New Mankind. This work was initiated in Jesus as the Christ.

Dr. Winter believes that fear has blotted out the awareness of our common interdependence in the metropolis. Fear has built the walls of segregation. Fear can be overcome by personal interdependence. The servant Church must acknowledge equality of opportunity in residence, education, employment, and human fraternity (p. 90). The broken communications (e.g., juvenile delinquency from broken communication in the neighborhood) must be restored by the servant Church. The "love" of the Church could even penetrate the walls which separate the East and the West. Man is a co-being and finds his true self in relationship to others. The author suggests his extreme case, "... the identity of the white man in the United States is dependent upon the way the Negro sees him and how he understands the Negro." His identity and meaning of life is bound with the impersonal world. Freedom is the power to conform to this impersonal world. The servant Church must lead in racial desegregation and produce a stable, communal life free from economic stress.

The author uses many Biblical terms such as "sin," "reconciliation," and "new creation," but the terms do not carry the orthodox meaning. It appears that he denies the validity of the Genesis account (p. 44), verbal inspiration of the Scriptures (p. 46), and the need of personal salvation from sin (pp. 13-20). The proposed idea of this book infringes on the freedom to choose neighbors, employees, fellowships, etc. The right to rise above one's circumstance or to use one's legal gain as seen fit is demolished herein. Instead of removing fear and hatred, the metropolis would multiply these and other distasteful features. The minority would rule the majority. The primary problem in Christianity is not the metropolis but apostasy. The Church of Jesus Christ has failed in propagation of the gospel, but the Church will never end because

Jesus Christ Himself is building the Church (Matt. 16:16-18). The New Birth and not the New Mankind is still the message of the Church. The New Birth is the essential element for entrance into the Body of Christ. We have an unchanging Christ for a changing world.

JAMES H. GABHART

Union Gospel Church
Waterloo, Iowa

GREAT SERMONS ON THE BIRTH OF CHRIST by celebrated preachers. Compiled by Wilbur M. Smith, W. A. Wilde Company, Natick, Massachusetts, 1963. 236 pp., \$4.50.

The purpose of the compiler of this valuable volume is clearly stated in the introduction. It is to gather together some of the greatest sermons available in the English language on the subject of the birth of Christ, choosing sermons preached on the texts generally recognized as most important in the Nativity narratives.

Great sermons are certainly difficult to select if not to discover, but Dr. Smith has picked some of the great ones and this book will prove a blessing to any minister who wishes some fresh sermonic inspiration on this subject and it will be a valuable addition to his library in other ways. In this volume are gathered fifteen sermons on twelve texts by ten great pulpiteers. Included is a short and interesting biographical sketch of each of the great preachers, a brief consideration of the observance of Christmas in the Christian Church, a few words about the names used for the Christmas season, a probable sequence of the nativity events as recorded in Matthew and Luke, an alphabetical list of the subjects related to the nativity narra-

tives, and a list of some of the more important books on the subject of Christmas. This last list is in addition to the more specific short bibliography given at the close of the sermons printed. Therefore this book is a valuable guide to the literature published on the birth of Christ as well as inspiration from the sermons themselves.

One or two of the sermons chosen may be disappointing in a group called "great." This must, of course, be a personal observation and may well stem from the influence of the times in which they were preached. Four of the messages which blessed the writer of the review most with their freshness and needed emphasis were: H. P. Liddon's "Mary, Our Model in Praising God" on Luke 1:46-48, a beautiful consideration of the Magnificat, H. P. Liddon's "Results of Christ's First Coming" on the much neglected text, Luke 2:34, Thomas A. Gurney's "The Sign and the Sword" on the same text, G. Campbell Morgan's "The Word Became Flesh" on John 1:14, which is a deep and soul thrilling expansion of his treatment of this text in his commentary on John's gospel.

Dr. Smith, in the introduction, states that this is the first in a proposed series of seven such volumes of great sermons, the others to be on the subjects of the Death of Christ, the Resurrection of Christ, the Second Advent of Christ, the Preeminence of Christ, the Holy Spirit and the Word of God. I, for one, shall look forward with great interest to the publication of these volumes.

I would certainly like to see this and the following books in the series made more available to ministers of modest means. I find it a little difficult to know why a volume of this nature and size should carry a price tag quite so high, being of good but standard hard back binding and paper. It might be well if those to follow would be published in paper-

back as well as the hard and more costly binding.

CHARLES ASHMAN, JR.
Winona Lake Brethren Church
Winona Lake, Indiana

CULTS AND ISMS, ANCIENT AND MODERN
by J. Oswald Sanders. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, revised 1962. 167 pp., \$2.50.

Dr. Sanders considers in this volume the beliefs of Roman Catholicism, Spiritism, Christian Science, Unity, Unitarianism, Jehovah's Witnesses, Theosophy, Christadelphianism and Mormonism. In addition, the author deals with British-Israelism, Freemasonry and the Healing Movement, groups which are often overlooked in such a book. With careful insight and understanding he exposes their errors and weaknesses in the light of Scripture teaching. He also has a concluding chapter on several other cultic groups which are quite small in comparison with those dealt with in the preceding chapters. These include Anthroposophy, the Cooneyites, the I Am cult and Rosicrucianism, among others.

The reviewer of this book is impressed with the compact way in which this New Zealand author has dealt with each one of the groups in his chapters without burdening his readers with a lot of relatively unimportant details. He has concisely presented the errors in connection with each cult and then has refuted these errors with the Word of God. He has evidently felt that the matter pressing for consideration in these variations from orthodoxy is not the failures of their leaders in the matter of living but rather the departures from true doctrine that have challenged the Christian faith. He has succeeded in presenting pertinent material

that other authors of similar works seem to have overlooked.

The reviewer would recommend this work as a splendid textbook for Bible classes, Sunday School classes or similar groups which desire a comprehensive treatment of the various false cults of the day. It will also be a good book to put into the hands of laymen who may be tempted to enter into one of these false groups. For a more involved study one needs such a work as J. K. Van Baalen's Chaos of Cults which Sanders himself recommends as the best book on the subject he has read.

HOMER A. KENT, SR.

Grace Theological Seminary

CALVIN: ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF HIS RELIGIOUS THOUGHT. By Francois Wendel (Tr. by Philip Mairet). Harper & Row, Publishers, New York and Evanston, 1963. 383 pp., \$6.00.

This book is divided into two main parts. The first has to do with a biographical outline of the subject of the book and presents this material in three appealing chapters. The first of these deals with "The Young Calvin" from his birth, early education and through his conversion experience. The second chapter considers the period in his life "From the First to the Second Period at Geneva." The third chapter discusses "The Organization of the Church in Geneva and the Struggle for Orthodoxy." This first section of the book is the work of a scholar who is acquainted with all the available source material and who knows how to choose the important matter to use in a book like this without becoming verbose. Wendel devotes 107 pages to his biographical sketch and every student of the life of Calvin will surely want to consult this fas-

cinating material and note the over 250 documentary citations at the bottom of the pages.

Part Two of the book is entitled, The Theological Doctrine. In this section there are five profusely documented chapters in which the author carefully analyzes the theological position of Calvin. He makes large use of Calvin's Institutes in his presentation, and shows how its author came by much of the material incorporated in this classic work, such as the writings of Augustine, Chrysostom, others of the Church Fathers and various scholastic writers. He shows Calvin's debt to such men of the Reformation as Luther, Zwingli, Bucer, Oecolampadius and others. He presents in the course of these five chapters Calvin's concept of such doctrines as that of God as creator and sovereign ruler of the world, God as redeemer in the Lord Jesus Christ, the doctrine of Predestination in all of its ramifications, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in its various facets, and in his last chapter he deals with the external means which God has provided for the Christian's well-being such as the Church, the Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Professor Wendel is well qualified for his task in writing this book, being the Dean of the Faculty of Protestant Theology at Strasbourg and is one of the world's outstanding experts on the history and literature of the Reformation. The writer of this review would recommend this new book as a splendid guide for all those who wish to pursue a careful study of the life and teachings of John Calvin.

HOMER A. KENT, SR.

Grace Theological Seminary

THE NEW BIBLE SURVEY. By J. Lawrence Eason. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1963. 538 pp. \$6.95

Dr. Eason, for thirty-six years a university professor of English and Literature, has published two previous works, both textbooks on English composition. This background would certainly help to explain why this book is so well written.

The New Bible Survey is designed for use in introductory Bible survey courses in Bible colleges, and Christian liberal arts colleges. The book divides the Bible into eight divisions for reading and study purposes. The Old Testament has four divisions: (1) The Historical Books (Genesis - Nehemiah), (2) The Psalms, (3) Books by the Wise Men of Israel (Proverbs - Song of Solomon), and (4) The Prophetical Books (Joel - Malachi). The New Testament likewise has four divisions: (1) The Gospels, (2) The Book of Acts, (3) The Letters of Paul, and (4) The Letters of the Apostles James, Peter, Jude and John. This seems to be a different and refreshing method of organizing and arranging the Biblical material. There is a special introduction for each of these main divisions as well as individual introductions to each of the 66 books. Finally, each of the books has a selected reading list which is one of the distinctive features of the book.

In looking at the New Bible Survey more in detail there are several conservative criticisms that this reviewer should like to make. First, there is no mention of how we got our Bible. There is an entire chapter devoted to the English versions of the Bible, but nothing on manuscripts and how they would differ from versions. This is, indeed, disappointing.

Second, while I realize that a book of this kind must be concise and give just the bare essentials for each book, still one wonders at the scant treatment of some books. For example, the book of Leviticus is given only a page and

a half with no mention of the five great offerings and their relationship to Christ. The Day of Atonement is completely ignored.

Third, some of Dr. Eason's statements are difficult for me to reconcile. For example, "...many modern readers, quite properly, feel that each of the 'seven days' of Creation may well represent vast periods of Creation time." (p. 70) Yet a little later he remarks, "In fact, it is a good rule in the reading of Scripture to take the text at its face value." (p. 74) Then too, in reference to Revelation 12-14, we read "...in these chapters the Woman is the Church of the covenants of both the Old and New Testaments, which bore a manchild, the Messiah and the Christ, the Savior of the world." It is my understanding that the woman that bore the man-child is Israel, not a combination of Israel and the church.

Fourth, something needs to be said with regard to the many bibliographies that are given. Each selective list is heavily laden with liberal works. There should have been phrases pointing out how radically liberal some of the selected books really are. The untrained Bible student is not guided as to what works are dependable and what are not. This, I think, is a real weakness in the book. I am not objecting to their inclusion, but the beginning Bible student needs to be warned. One wonders also why some of the excellent conservative works are not listed, e.g. Explore the Book by J. Sidlow Baxter, The Word of God in History by Loyal R. Ringenberg, The Treasury of David by C. H. Spurgeon, and Dr. Campbell Morgan's superb works on Matthew and Acts.

In spite of these criticisms the volume should prove exceedingly helpful. Dr. Eason would most certainly be included in the ranks of conservative scholarship. I commend the volume with the above-mentioned reservations.

RICHARD G. MESSNER

Grace College

JESUS' TITLE TO THE THRONE OF DAVID. By W. W. Barndollar. The Dunham Publishing Company, Findlay, Ohio. 1963. 151 pages, \$2.50

This volume is not only a serious addition to the present literature in the field of eschatology, but likewise will prove valuable in the areas of fulfilled prophecy, studies in the Gospels and related materials.

Dr. Barndollar is at present professor of Bible at Baptist Bible Seminary in Johnson City, New York. He completed his post-graduate work at Grace Seminary and this book is based upon his master's thesis.

The author begins his work with two assumptions: (1) that an earthly kingdom with a physical throne will exist and (2) that the reader believes in the pre-millennial return of Christ. For those of us who agree with the author this book will add to our position; however, the contents are somewhat vulnerable to those who may challenge his assumptions.

The three great problems in establishing Jesus Christ's genealogy are considered at length. First, the author maintains that Christ could become heir-apparent only through the adoption by Joseph and that Mary's blood line, of itself, could not have qualified him for the throne. Second, the identical names in the two genealogies (Matthew and Luke) could not refer to the same people in a cross of these lines since Christ would then have received the curse of Coniah through Mary and would have been rendered ineligible as a Messianic king. Third, by the perfect balance of God Christ could inherit the throne and yet avoid the crippling curse--He performed this in the virgin birth.

Two essentials are presented as pre-requisites to inheriting the Davidic throne. One, the person had to be of the royal family and two, he had to be of the legal branch of that

family. Joseph fulfilled both and could pass them on to Jesus.

The reader may be left with one pressing question in this book. Did Joseph ever knowingly relegate the right of the throne to Jesus or was this merely assumed automatically when Joseph decided to accept the child? In either case, is there a precedence for this in the Old Testament?

The only objection to this work is concerning several awkward statements, such as the author's use of the original languages only as secondary tools (p. viii).

This book is a thorough, systematic study of Christ's legal rights in anticipation of God's future program. The reviewer would recommend it for every Christian who cares to study.

WILLIAM L. COLEMAN
Winona Lake, Indiana

THEM HE GLORIFIED. By Bernard Ramm. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1963. 148 pages, \$3.25.

Doctor Ramm authored this volume to meet a genuine need expressed in his introduction: "I found no book which systematically explored the doctrine." His years of experience as Professor of Systematic Theology as well as large range of study, as evidenced in this book, make him well qualified to discuss the subject.

Although a knowledge of the original Hebrew and Greek are not essential to appreciating this book, nevertheless at least an acquaintance with them would prove helpful. The word "glory" is expounded from its earliest use in the Old Testament and carried to its final use of glorification in a proper eschatological setting. Doctor Ramm's thoughts are well documented, adding force to his positions.

Of particular value to the preaching minister is a chapter on "The Glory of Jesus Christ." In this section the author examines Christ's pre-incarnate glory, glory in his earthly life, in the transfiguration, in his death, in his resurrection, his ascension, his second coming and in the ages to come. This leads the author to state, "One could say that Christ's glory is a faithful reproduction of the original glory of God. Thus the Son is the Lord of Glory, and the Glory, and the reflection of the glory of God" (page 30). Numerous comparisons are made between divine glory and Christ's glory suggesting proof of his deity.

Some readers may find the chapter entitled "The Glorification of the Soul" somewhat incomplete especially in regard to pinpointing a definition of exactly what is being glorified. Other readers will want to study carefully the chapter concerning "The Glorification of the New Jerusalem" in connection with the last chapter, "Glorification as Glorious Existence," as they will prove informative and thought provoking.

This work seems to be a significant contribution. The reviewer would encourage anyone to become acquainted with this scholarly work.

WILLIAM L. COLEMAN

Winona Lake, Indiana

ANGEL OF THE GARDEN. By G. Hall Todd. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1961. 96 pages, \$1.50.

This work presents a series of eight Easter season sermons written by Dr. G. Hall Todd, the present minister of the Arch Street Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Dr. Todd has much the same gift in the use of illustrations as did his predecessor at that Arch Street church pulpit, Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney. The author, being an untiring

scholar and a widely read individual, draws on many and varied sources for his illustrative material, especially from biography, history, and poetry. He has an excellent vocabulary and a dignified manner of expressing himself.

These sermons may be considered typical of Dr. Todd's style and method of sermonization. Each could be classified as topical in form dealing particularly with a doctrine or prominent Biblical theme whose basic idea is derived from a short Bible text. This is strengthened by interesting and varied sermon subjects, practical applications, and illustrations.

In contrast to these strong areas the chief criticisms of the sermons are that Dr. Todd occasionally falls into the trap of developing arbitrary or weak points with little or no Biblical support, of adding extraneous transitions to introduce illustrations, and at times using an unneeded illustration or quotation. His Reformed amillennarian theological position is naturally reflected in his work. However, these sermons are helpful, interesting, and thought provoking to pastor or layman.

DWIGHT ACOMB

Winona Lake, Indiana

STEPS TO THE SERMON. By H. C. Brown, Jr., H. Gordon Clinard, and Jessie J. Northcutt. Broadman Press, Nashville, Tennessee, 1963, 196 pp., \$4.50.

The professors of homiletics at Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in Fort Worth, Texas, have made a positive and practical contribution to the field of homiletics in the production of this volume. It is an outgrowth of their own experience in sermon production and delivery as well as their extensive experience in the teaching of homiletics. Their purpose is to guide the preacher in the proper sequence of sermon building from the moment

that the seed thought is conceived, through its cultivation and maturation, to the time of its actual delivery. For this reason the various factors concerned in sermon building are considered in chronological sequence. Their purpose in utilizing this organization is "...so that a preacher not only understands what he is doing and how he is doing it, but he understands when he should do it" (pp. vii-viii). That they have carried out their plan is seen from the titles of the chapters of their book. The first chapter, *Understanding the Task*, gives a brief survey of the Greek words used in the New Testament to describe preaching and also considers the definition of preaching given by a number of homiletical geniuses. The definition of preaching which the authors adopt is as follows: "Preaching is the effective communication of divine truth, as contained in the Christian Scriptures, by a man called of God to witness for him to a redemptive deed for the purpose of giving eternal life through Jesus Christ" (p. 8).

The inclusion of the last few words in the definition makes it too narrow for it limits preaching to evangelistic preaching and overlooks entirely preaching that has instruction and edification as its goal. Nor would this definition fit five of the six goals of preaching which the authors set forth (pp. 16-18). The chapter does have an interesting sketch of the history of preaching (pp. 18-29) though it is somewhat unusual that the authors begin the ancient period at A. D. 70 thus excluding the preaching of the New Testament as a part of the development of Christian preaching.

The second chapter, *Discovering the Idea of the Sermon*, sets forth a number of areas from which the germinal truth of the sermon might spring and then shows how to relate that idea to a text, a thesis, and an objective. All of these things aid in bringing definiteness to the sermon.

The third chapter, *Interpreting the Text*, is one of the most valuable contributions made by this book. The authors set forth the various types of interpretation--allegorical, dogmatic, mystical, rationalistic, modern, and grammatico-historical--and set forth reasons why all but the grammatico-historical method are unsatisfactory and to be avoided in preaching. The authors then give a good plan whereby the grammatico-historical method of interpretation can be implemented in preaching. They include a particularly helpful discussion showing one how to analyze a text grammatically.

The fourth chapter, *Gathering Material*, contains a number of suggestions of areas from which information can be gathered; the need, use, and qualities of illustrations; and methods of preserving sermonic material thus gathered. This helpful chapter could be strengthened by including material on the usage of specific exegetical tools such as concordances, Bible dictionaries and encyclopedias, Bible atlases, and commentaries.

The fifth chapter, *Maturing the Idea*, develops and illustrates three ways in which a sermon idea can properly mature before its delivery: (1) by seeking divine leadership, (2) by giving the subconscious mind sufficient time to work, and (3) by a creative usage of time.

The sixth chapter, *Formulating the Structure*, has many good and practical suggestions and illustrations for structuring the outline of the sermon. The outline is probably the weakest part of evangelistic preaching today. Men are generally better able to gather and present material than they are able to organize the material into a logical outline that gives both foundation and unity to their sermons. Men who are having difficulty with outlining their sermons will receive particular benefit from this portion of the book.

The final two chapters, *Finishing the Sermon* and *Delivering the Sermon*, deal with the finished product. They lay stress upon the necessity for clarity of thought expression in the sermon. The former chapter has many good suggestions concerning the writing of a sermon which are particularly helpful in developing clarity of thought within the sermon. The latter chapter deals with the actual delivery of the sermon and contains many helpful suggestions but if one has difficulty in this area he could probably achieve more specific help from a good speech book. The emphasis that is important in this section of the book is that the style of delivery is the vehicle through which the content is conveyed to the hearers. Evangelistic ministers generally need to be reminded of the necessity of an interesting delivery to convey the truth they desire their congregations to know. It has been well-said that the unpardonable sin of preaching is boring people to death with the eternally fresh Word of God.

Pastors will receive fresh stimulation from this book to improve their process of sermon construction, their sermon content, and their sermon delivery. While this book would be better suited to a college homiletics course than a seminary homiletics course, seminarians will receive benefit from its reading because it greatly simplifies the terminology and procedures outlined in more advanced homiletical books.

PAUL R. FINK

Grace Theological Seminary

THE FOUR MAJOR CULTS. By Anthony A. Hoekema. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1963. 447 pp., \$5.95.

The author of this work, Anthony A. Hoekema, is the Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at Calvin Theological Seminary.

located at Grand Rapids, Michigan. He wrote the book out of a teaching need while instructing a course in cults to seminarians. He felt the need for a better understanding of the beliefs of the cults in their totality. He was challenged to engage in a careful analysis of each cult under consideration in order to give a fair presentation of that cult.

In his book he chose to consider only four major cults because of his desire to give thorough treatment to a few cults rather than a summary treatment of a larger number. So he decided to deal with what he considers to be the four largest and most influential cults. The four he has chosen, by the way, each have their roots deeply implanted in American soil.

The main purpose of this book, according to its author, "is to set forth in a systematic way the doctrinal teachings of Christian Science, Jehovah's Witnesses, Mormonism, and Seventh-day Adventism. Among these four it is to be noted that Seventh-day Adventism is included as a cult. In Chapter VI he tells why it should be so considered.

The four cults are analyzed in their chronological order, Mormonism being dealt with first (organized in 1830), Seventh-day Adventism second (first General Conference held in 1863), Christian Science third (incorporated in 1879), and last in order comes the discussion of Jehovah's Witnesses (first corporate organization in 1884).

The pattern of treatment of the four cults is as follows: first, a brief history of the cult is given; next, the question of the source of authority appealed to by the cult is considered; and, finally, the doctrines taught by the cult are expounded in the order of the customary divisions of Christian theology: God, man, Christ, salvation, the church, eschatology. In this treatment Dr. Hoekema has made almost exclusive use of primary source material. He has contacted cult headquarters and

written letters to cult leaders. He has produced a work that is refreshingly up to date.

In five appendices added to the four chapters dealing exclusively with each of the cults certain distinctive cult teachings are given critical evaluation. These are: the alleged genuineness of the Book of Mormon as an additional sacred scripture, the investigative judgment and scape-goat doctrines in Seventh-day Adventism, Seventh-day Adventist teachings on the Sabbath, the Jehovah-Witness denial of the deity of Christ, and the teachings of both Seventh-day Adventists and Jehovah's Witnesses on soul extinction in the intermediate state and on the final annihilation of the wicked. These appendices provide some of the most helpful material in the book.

All of the above material is included in Chapters II-V. Chapter I is devoted to the lessons that may be learned from the cults, an excellent and sobering chapter. Chapter VI is a setting forth of some of the distinctive traits of the cults. It is in this chapter that the author explains why he considers Seventh-day Adventism to be a cult in spite of some of its orthodox views. The final chapter, Chapter VII, presents some excellent material on Approaching the Cultist. He gives some warnings and sound advice for all those who seek to win cultists from the error of their ways.

The reviewer of this work heartily commends this book as a careful, comprehensive, readable, scholarly analysis of the four cults investigated.

HOMER A. KENT, SR.
Grace Theological Seminary

PREACHING VALUES FROM THE PAPYRI. By Herschel H. Hobbs. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan. 1964. 123 pp., \$2.95.

The pastor of the First Baptist Church of Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, and the past presi-

dent of the Southern Baptist Convention has contributed a helpful volume to preachers who would seek to explain and illustrate the meaning of certain New Testament words. In this volume the author considers a selected group of about forty New Testament Greek words (among them airō, apisteō, apostasia, archēgos, arrabōn, bebaioō, baptizō, diathēkē, dokimazō, entugchanō, huiothesia, koinōneō, logizomai, louō, nipō, paidagōgos, parousia, pisteuō, and teleō). The procedure followed in this undertaking is to examine the particular word as it appears in the papyri and the New Testament. The author seeks to point out any points of enrichment that the papyri usage contributes to the interpretation of the New Testament usage.

This is not a critical work and to that extent its usefulness is limited to serious students of the New Testament. This is true because of the author's policy, which, in his own words, is: "With rare exceptions no attempt is made to give either the dates or the original language of the papyri examples. The important thing is to give the English translations of these examples and to relate them to the New Testament passages where these words are used. Exact dates of the examples are not of primary importance for this work. They range all the way from the third century to the fourth century A.D. But their usage serves to show the current meaning of given words in the period just prior to, during, and immediately after the time of the writing of the New Testament. And since in most instances these meanings span the years, in some cases carrying over into Modern Greek, they are of value to show their connotations in the New Testament itself." (p. 6) To the serious student who might wish to verify the author's findings both the date and identity of the particular papyrus cited are very important. It is possible that in some instances he might find that the material is capable of another equally plausible translation or interpretation. Because of the author's stated policy, this

cannot be done. Further, the serious student of the New Testament would not necessarily agree with the author's premise that the date of a manuscript is of relatively little consequence. Because a certain word meant something in a third century B.C. manuscript or in a fourth century A.D. manuscript does not necessarily mean that it means the same thing in the New Testament. In the case of the former, the New Testament often takes an old familiar term and fills it with entirely new connotations. In the case of the latter its meaning could be influenced by and even derived from the New Testament usage.

Two things make this volume of particular help to the preacher who is not well-versed in Greek: (1) its uncritical nature and (2) the English translations which are always included. While this particular group of preachers will receive the most help from this book, all who read it will receive suggestions concerning the New Testament usage of the words considered, at least as the author understands that usage to be.

PAUL R. FINK

Grace Theological Seminary

JESUS THE MASTER TEACHER. By Herman Harrell Horne. Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, Michigan. 1964. 210 pp.

This book is a reprint of the author's work first published in 1920. In the words of the author the aim of this work is twofold: "first, immediately, to see how Jesus taught, or is presented to us as having taught, and, second, ultimately, to influence our own methods of teaching morals and religion." The viewpoint from which the author approaches his task "... is not the content of the teachings of Jesus, where all the controversies rage, but the form in which this content is cast." In pursuit of his topic the author considers such topics as Jesus' way of securing attention, His points of

contact, His aims, His use of problems, His conversations, His questions, His answers, His discourses, His parables, His use of Scripture, His use of apperception, His use of symbols, and several other equally interesting topics.

By means of leading questions the author leads the reader into an inductive study of the methods that Jesus used in His teaching. This book could ideally be used as a stimulus for discussion in a teacher training program in the local church. Each chapter could well serve as a topic of discussion at each meeting. If this plan were followed it would last twenty-six weeks. Supplementary material could be gained by parallel reading of other materials (though if each person studied each topic as fully as the book suggests he would have little time for parallel reading) or through the instructor in the course.

This book should be in every church, Christian college, and seminary library as well as in the library of every Christian educator and pastor. Its topic will bear repeated study. We are thankful to Kregels for making it readily available to us once again.

PAUL R. FINK

Grace Theological Seminary

POWER IN EXPOSITORY PREACHING. By Faris D. Whitesell. Fleming H. Revell Co., New Jersey. 1963. 149 pp., \$4.00.

Preaching is an art and as such can be greatly improved by all who practice it. Dr. Whitesell suggests ten areas from which power in expository preaching can be drawn: Motivation, Diversification, Explanation, Organization, Argumentation, Illustration, Application, Imagination, Preparation, and Communication. The author devotes a chapter to each of these areas giving suggestions and illustrations concerning each.

While all of this book can be read with profit, this reviewer feels that the author makes his strongest contributions in four particular areas. The first is in the Preface in which he gives the five leading definitions of expository preaching together with quotations from the leading exponents of each view. He concludes (and rightly so, in the opinion of this reviewer) that whether a sermon is expository depends upon how the preacher handles the text rather than on the length or content of the text. The second strong contribution is in the chapter entitled *Power through Organization* (Chapter 4). In this chapter the author explains why a good outline is necessary to every sermon, discusses the characteristics that a good outline should have, gives many illustrations of good outlines, and explains how to construct a good outline. Since this is the weakest area in most sermons today this chapter is particularly vital.

The third strong contribution is in the fourth chapter (*Power through Argumentation*) in which the author gives ten methods whereby argumentation (which he equates with persuasion) can be incorporated into expository preaching. The adoption of these methods by any expository preacher will definitely increase its interest to the hearers.

The fourth strong contribution is found in the final chapter (*Power through Communication*). The particular contribution that Dr. Whitesell makes in this area is his strong emphasis upon the necessity of the preacher's

proper relationship to the Holy Spirit if he is going to realize effective communication of his message. The questionnaire which Dr. Whitesell's students sent out in this respect indicates that none of the responding preachers really understood what the power of the Holy Spirit in preaching is (viz., being filled or controlled by the Holy Spirit) or how it could certainly be achieved (viz., by the confession of all known sin). This, perhaps, explains why so many preachers are weak in their pulpit ministries for they are apparently ignorant of the way that the Holy Spirit works in and through men.

This book is designed for the average preacher. Seminary men who are equipped with the working capital of Hebrew and Greek will find it elementary in some areas, particularly in the tools suggested for obtaining background data, exegetical data, structural data, contextual data, and cross reference data (Chapter 3, *Power through Explanation*). However, every preacher can read this book with profit for it will stimulate him to improve his preaching and will give him some simple and workable suggestions to enable him to do it. Preachers who would like to adopt expository preaching as their method but have hesitated to do so will receive the most help from this book. It is heartily recommended to the readers of the GRACE JOURNAL.

PAUL R. FINK
Grace Theological Seminary

BOOKS RECEIVED

- SCIENCE, GOD, AND YOU. By Enno Wolthuis. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1963. 121 pages, \$2.50.
- PROPHETIC PREACHING THEN AND NOW. By Roland Q. Leavell. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1963. 96 pages, \$2.25.
- THE RELEVANCE OF PREACHING. By Pierre Ch. Marcel. Trans. by Rob Roy McGregor. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1963. 110 pages, \$2.95.
- THE PROPHETS AND THE PROMISE. By Willis J. Beecher. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1963, reprint. 427 pages, \$3.95.
- MODERN THINKERS SERIES: WILLIAM JAMES. By Gordon H. Clark. Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1963. 47 pages, \$1.25, paper.
- THE DEAD SEA SCRIPTURES in English Translation, revised edition. By Theodore Gaster. Double Day and Company, Garden City, New York, 1964. 420 pages, \$1.45, paper.
- RELIGIOUS CONFLICT IN AMERICA. Ed. by Earl Raab. Doubleday and Company, Garden City, New York, 1964. 231 pages, \$1.25, paper.
- JESUS' TITLE TO THE THRONE OF DAVID. By W. W. Barndollar. Dunham Publishing Co., Findlay, Ohio, 1963. 151 pages, \$2.50.
- HELP YOURSELF TO LIFE. By Roy L. Laurin. Dunham Publishing Co., Findlay, Ohio, 1963. 102 pages, paper.
- THEM HE GLORIFIED. By Bernard Ramm. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1963. 148 pages, \$3.25.
- TYNDALE BIBLE COMMENTARIES, VI, THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS. By F. F. Bruce. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1963. 288 pages, \$3.00.
- TYNDALE BIBLE COMMENTARIES, X, THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE EPHESIANS. By F. Foulkes. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1963. 182 pages, \$3.00.
- GOD'S COVENANTS, ROMANS 9:1-11:36. By Donald Grey Barnhouse. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1963. 176 pages, \$3.50.
- THE NEW TESTAMENT IN PLAIN ENGLISH. By Charles Kingsley Williams. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1963. 545 & 27 pages, \$3.95.
- CALVIN'S COMMENTARIES: HEBREWS AND I AND II PETER. Trans. by W. B. Johnston. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1963. 379 pages, \$6.00.
- THE BASIS OF CHRISTIAN UNITY. By D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1963. 64 pages, \$.50, paper.
- INTERPRETING THE BIBLE. By A. Berkeley Mickelsen. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Grand Rapids, 1963. 425 pages, \$5.95.
- THE FOUR MAJOR CULTS. By Anthony Hoekema. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1963. 447 pages, \$5.95.
- FAITH AND PHILOSOPHY. By Alvin Plantinga. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1964. 225 pages, \$4.95.
- VOCABULARY OF COMMUNISH. By Lester DeKoster. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1964. 224 pages, \$3.50.
- CHRIST AND THE CHURCH, An Exposition Of Ephesians. By Dale Moody. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1963. 153 pages, \$2.95. (paper, \$1.45).
- A RELEVANT SALVATION. By R. E. O. White. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1963. 132 pages, \$2.25.
- MAN IN COMMUNITY. By Russell Phillip Shedd. Wm. B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1964. 209 pages, \$1.95, paper.

- POWER IN EXPOSITORY PREACHING. By Faris D. Whitesell. Fleming H. Revell Co., Westwood, N. J., 1963. XVI, 174 pages, \$4.00.
- MORALITY AND BEYOND. By Paul Tillich. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1963. 95 pages, \$2.75.
- ETHICS IN A CHRISTIAN CONTEXT. By Paul L. Lehmann. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1963. 384 pages, \$5.00.
- THE RESPONSIBLE SELF. By H. Richard Niebuhr. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York, 1963. 183 pages, \$3.50.
- HIGLEY COMMENTARY, 1964. By Jasper A. Huffman, ed. Lambert Huffman Publishers, Winona Lake, Indiana, 1963. 528 pages, \$2.95.
- JESUS THE MASTER TEACHER. By Herman Harrell Horne. Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids, 1964. 212 pages, \$3.50, reprint.
- THE PASTOR AND HIS WORK. By Homer A. Kent, Sr. Moody Press, Chicago, 1963. 301 pages, \$4.50.
- THE FIELDS AT HOME. By Peter F. Gunther. Moody Press, Chicago, 1963. 283 pages, \$4.50.
- CAN I TRUST MY BIBLE? By eight evangelical scholars. Moody Press, Chicago, 1964. 190 pages, \$3.50.
- GROUP COUNSELING. By Joseph W. Knowles. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood, N. J., 1964. 144 pages, \$2.95.
- ROMANS, AN INTERPRETIVE OUTLINE. By David N. Steele and Curtis C. Thomas. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, 1963. 200 pages, \$5.00.
- THE FIVE POINTS OF CALVINISM DEFINED, DEFENDED, DOCUMENTED. By David N. Steele and Curtis C. Thomas. Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Philadelphia, 1963. 95 pages, \$1.50, paper.
- PELOUBET'S SELECT NOTES ON THE INTERNATIONAL BIBLE LESSONS, 1964. By Wilbur M. Smith. W. A. Wilde, Natick, Mass., 1963. 419 pages, \$2.95.
- GREAT SERMONS ON THE BIRTH OF CHRIST. Compiled by Wilbur M. Smith. W. A. Wilde Co., Natick, Mass., 1963. 236 pages., \$4.50.
- THE VALIDITY OF THE VIRGIN BIRTH. By Howard A. Hanke. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1963. 122 pages, \$2.50.
- CULTS AND ISMS, ANCIENT AND MODERN. By J. Oswald Sanders. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, 1962. 167 pages, \$2.50.



GRACE JOURNAL

A PUBLICATION OF GRACE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Winona Lake, Indiana

FALL 1964

VOL. 5

NO. 3

GRACE JOURNAL

A publication of Grace Theological Seminary

VOLUME 5

FALL, 1964

NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

THE DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION OF FRENCH PROTESTANTISM	James R. Renick	3
HERMENEUTICAL PRINCIPLES AND CREATION THEORIES	Gary G. Cohen	17
BIBLICAL NUMERICS	John J. Davis	30
BOOK REVIEWS		45

GRACE JOURNAL is published three times each year (Winter, Spring, Fall) by Grace Theological Seminary, in cooperation with the Grace Seminary Alumni Association.

EDITORIAL POLICY: The editors of **GRACE JOURNAL** hold the historic Christian faith, and accept without reservation the inerrancy of Scripture and the premillennial view of eschatology. A more complete expression of their theological position may be found in the Statement of Faith of Grace Theological Seminary. The editors, however, do not necessarily endorse every opinion that may be expressed by individual writers in the **JOURNAL**.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$2.00 per calendar year; single copy, 75c.

ADDRESS: All subscriptions and review copies of books should be sent to **GRACE JOURNAL**, Box 397, Winona Lake, Indiana.

Copyright, 1964, by Grace Theological Seminary. All rights reserved.

EDITORIAL STAFF

HOMER A. KENT, JR.
Editor

JOHN C. WHITCOMB, JR.
Managing Editor

HERMAN A. HOYT
General Review Editor

S. HERBERT BESS
Book Review Editor

JAMES L. BOYER
E. WILLIAM MALE
KENNETH G. MOELLER
Business Committee

ALVA J. McCLAIN
HOMER A. KENT, SR.
PAUL R. FINK
Consulting Editors

GRACE JOURNAL is indexed in CHRISTIAN PERIODICAL INDEX.

THE DEVELOPMENT AND TRANSFORMATION OF FRENCH PROTESTANTISM

JAMES R. RENICK
Princeton, New Jersey

The study of the development and transformation of French Protestantism in the sixteenth century presents a situation strikingly related to the contemporary scene. Nowhere is this relationship more clear than on the many foreign missionary fields of the world where Protestant evangelical missions have made such an impact during the past century.

In the evangelization of large unbelieving populations and in the organization and training of indigenous national churches and Christian leadership, a host of vital questions have faced both missionary and national Christian alike. The desirability of highly-developed ecclesiastical organization, the wisdom of seeking the support of sympathetic officials in the local and national governments, the degree of association of the national church with foreign sources of income and power, the use of converted priests and monks in public Christian work are all matters common to the sixteenth century and to our present era. The questions have become no less delicate or crucial with the passage of centuries. The seriousness of the outcome is illustrated by the tragic results which followed 1562 in France. In our modern situation the final outcome is yet to be determined in many areas.

The sixteenth century was "...an age of transition...a period of instability, of rapidly changing concepts, of widening vistas, and of unprecedented innovations."¹ Western Europe experienced the consolidation of the nation-state, the continued rise of the "New Monarchies," the great expansion of the European "money-economy," the declaration of religious reform, the rise and spread of the Lutheran and Reformed faiths, and the revitalization of the Catholic Church through the Counter-Reformation. France, geographically and culturally an integral part of Western Europe, was affected by all of these movements during the course of the century.

In our day the casual student of history might easily forget that the religious question was ever a vital and central one in French domestic affairs. And yet, exactly four centuries ago, that nation was poised on the brink of three decades of civil wars fought ostensibly to

A senior thesis submitted to the History Department of Princeton University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, May, 1960. Abridged by the author.

test whether it were possible for two antagonistic and competitive religious systems, Catholicism and Calvinism, to co-exist in France under the same law and the same king.

Francis I ascended the throne in 1515 and within a year he signed the Concordat of Bologna with Pope Leo X. From the very beginning, then, the crown and the church were formally joined together in a firm union.² At the same time the first faint voices of reform were heard in certain parts of France. These initial voices were those of scholars through whose work the Bible in the vernacular was placed in the hands and hearts of the people of France. The first forty years of the century were times of relative domestic peace. There was fairly persistent persecution of heretical elements, but the main attention of the nation was focused on intermittent foreign wars.³ The "new doctrines" spread especially among the urban and semi-urban segments of the population. In the reign of Henry II this growth became even more prominent and began to affect the upper classes.

In marked contrast to this first period, the last forty years of the century, 1559-1598, were decades of civil war throughout the whole of France. These civil wars are known commonly in history as "the French wars of religion." In these protracted struggles, the nation was rent with bitter fighting and unspeakable atrocities.⁴ Among the most crucial factors responsible for the contrast between the earlier and later periods of French history of this century was a transformation which took place in the very composition and nature of the French Protestant movement. After having been characteristically pacific and submissive throughout the earlier years prior to 1555, the Protestant party after 1559-1560 had a powerful political and military character.⁵ Prior to 1555, the emphasis in the Protestant party was mainly evangelistic. After 1560 and during the civil warfare, political and religious reform often were almost synonymous.⁶

In large measure this transformation of the Protestant party was accomplished in the six years from 1555 through 1560. Three of the most important factors in the accomplishment of this change will be considered in this discussion. There was the foundation and organization of the local and national Reformed Church of France. Another factor was the influence exercised in French Protestant affairs by John Calvin and Theodore Beza from the Swiss city of Geneva.⁷ The third factor was the rise and expansion of the group of "political Huguenots" within the ranks of the professing Protestant Church in France. They were men who found Protestantism an ideal vehicle for pursuing political, military and social objectives, and in this pursuit spurned spiritual means and ends and the advice of spiritual leaders. Their religious convictions, often dictated by personal and political exigencies, are difficult to assess with regard to their essence and depth. These are three vital factors which contributed to the making of a Protestant movement which by 1562 was willing and capable of opposing the Roman Catholic Church and royal authority in sustained military operations.

RESIGNED MARTYRDOM 1515-1553

During the years from 1515 to 1553, French Protestantism assumed a definite doctrinal position and repeatedly displayed unswerving loyalty and obedience to God and King, in that order. At the same time the nation of France as a whole experienced serious changes in the

domestic balance of power which set the stage for civil conflict in the latter half of the century.

Francis I succeeded his father-in-law, Louis XII, in 1515. He brought to the throne of France a dominant personality, but also a dissolute one. He ruled a rich and prosperous nation.⁸ In the initial years of his reign, France was undergoing an intellectual revolution which caused increased interest on the part of educated Frenchmen in academic and religious developments in other countries, less patience with the glaring abuses of the corrupt Roman Catholic Church, and more openness to unorthodox theories and doctrines especially of a mystical nature.⁹ Francis I was reasonably sympathetic to an emphasis on education and intellectual exploration. Due to the influence of his sister, Margaret of Angoulême, and to his own inclination to some vague ecclesiastical reforms, the king hesitated to adopt a definite policy with regard to the reforming elements until after 1534.¹⁰

Meaux, a city situated on the Seine River some forty miles upstream from Paris, became the early center of the reforming movement. Jacques Lefèvre d'Etaples (Faber Stapulensis) is recognized as the initial herald of Protestantism in France. He advocated two "proto-Lutheran" ideas: that works have no merit apart from the grace of God and that there is the real presence of Christ but no transubstantiation in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.¹¹ One of d'Etaples' former students became Bishop of Meaux in 1516 and invited his old professor to join him there. Around these two men at Meaux there gathered a group of young men including William Farel. They were intent upon reforming the Catholic Church in order that it might conform with the teaching of the Scriptures.¹²

In 1521 the faculty of the Sorbonne condemned Luther and his writings.¹³ Two years later the New Testament in French was finished and published by d'Etaples. Then the storm began to break. The reformers at Meaux were forced to disperse and many found refuge in Strasbourg. But the New Testament in French and other of their writings and Luther's remained and circulated among the common people after their flight.¹⁴ After 1525 the outright protection of reformers by Margaret of Angoulême and others of the royal family began to wane. During the following seven years the attitude of the king toward Protestantism vacillated between favor and fury. By June, 1540, the royal vacillation had been replaced by a determination to prove the orthodoxy of the French throne by thoroughly purging the kingdom of heretics of all kinds.

In the twenty years preceding 1555, Protestant teaching and faith spread throughout every province in France, with the exception of Brittany. This penetration was accomplished quietly and mainly on the basis of personal witnessing and small-scale evangelization. The best available evidences indicate that Protestantism, by the beginning of the reign of Henry II in 1547, had advanced most in the urban areas and among the ranks of the common people, such as small tradesmen, artisans, servants and petty officials.¹⁵ Most of the nobles that were affected went into exile in Germany or Switzerland. Theodore Beza's life is a clear illustration of this pattern.¹⁶

John Calvin fled from Paris and then from France in the years immediately following 1534. In 1541 he published his Institutes of the Christian Religion in French and from this

point on the leadership of the Protestant movement in France passed into the hands of "The Reformer of Geneva." The Institutes provided for the Protestants of France a logical and thorough statement and explanation of the Reformed position. It also provided a model for ecclesiastical organization. Yet they gained more than just this, for Calvin maintained an active correspondence with various individuals and congregations.

The honor of having the first formal Protestant church in France belongs to Meaux in 1546, but due to its very short existence the church organized in Paris some nine years later is commonly referred to as the first official Protestant church in France. In the fall of 1546 on October 4, the Parlement of Paris (the supreme judicial body of France and not to be confused with the representative assembly or "parliament" of contemporary England) issued a warrant of arrest against fifty-seven Protestants of Meaux describing them as "Lutherans."¹⁷

In France there was great variety in the terms used to designate Protestants. The more common and more popular term in the years before 1560 was "Lutheran." The term "Huguenot" came into widespread use at the time of the conspiracy of Amboise in 1560. It has continued to the present as the almost universal term applied to members of the Reformed Church of France. The origins of this term remain extremely obscure despite extensive research.¹⁸

Despite severe persecution "the new doctrines" continued to spread, finding especially strong response in southern and western sections of France. The death of Francis I and the beginning of the reign of his son, Henry II, in 1547, led only to an intensification of the persecution of Protestant believers.

A series of developments earlier in the century had drawn the entire House of Bourbon into disrepute. Charles of Bourbon, former Constable of France, had been forced to flee the country. Nevertheless his sons were still "Princes of the Blood," i.e., members of the second royal family in the realm and cousins of the king. The three Bourbon brothers were Antoine, who became King of Navarre as the husband of Jeanne d'Albret, Charles, the Cardinal of Bourbon, and Louis, the Lord of Conde.

In reality the two most influential families at the French court in this century were those of the House of Montmorency and of the House of Guise. The House of Montmorency was led by Anne of Montmorency, a man of considerable ability who was Marshal of France, Grandmaster of the Palace, and Constable. The Chatillon family was related to that of Montmorency and included three brothers who figured very prominently in the affairs of France during the second half of the sixteenth century: Odet, the Cardinal of Chatillon; Gaspard of Coligny, later Admiral of France; Francis of Coligny, the Lord of Andelot and commonly known as "D'Andelot." These three men were nephews of Constable Montmorency.

The House of Guise was represented by the six sons of Claude of Guise. The two elder brothers, who were the more prominent, were Francis, the Duke of Guise, a fine military leader, and Charles, at first Cardinal of Guise and later Cardinal of Lorraine, a brilliant but unscrupulous individual. The House of Guise straddled the two great political powers of

the century in Europe. Some of its lands were held from the Holy Roman Empire, while others were subject to the King of France. This lack of definite national loyalties led the Guises to place themselves at the head of the somewhat international Catholic Party in France.¹⁹ The rivalry between the Guises and the Montmorency faction was of critical importance in the reign of Henry II and in the years after his death.

French Protestantism by the middle of the reign of Henry II had grown to proportions which required and received the most active repression and persecution on the part of the royal government.

There is no movement in history more diverse, more complex in its origins, its basic forces and its divisions; moreover there has never been anything more national or local than the French Reformation, as one can view it before the permanent constitution of the churches and the outbreak of the civil wars, which made all the subdivisions fall...²⁰

ORGANIZATION AND PENETRATION 1553-1559

If the years prior to 1553 formed predominantly "a period of resigned martyrdom" for French Protestantism, the last half of the reign of Henry II can be described as a period of organization and penetration.²¹ Formal church organization spread rapidly, the number of Protestant believers increased substantially, the number of noble and socially prominent Protestants grew, and the influence and role of Geneva in French Protestant affairs expanded. Each of these developments progressed steadily and reached something of a climax during the first half of the year 1559. At this point the unexpected death of Henry II in July, 1559, plunged the nation into a severe crisis. In the midst of this crisis, these trends in Protestantism coalesced to provide the basis for the politically militant role filled by Protestantism in the three years which intervened between the death of Henry II and the outbreak of civil warfare in 1562.

Local Organization on a National Scale

During the years from 1534 to 1553, the Protestant ranks were filled mainly by small tradesmen, artisans, domestic servants, petty officials, and laborers. Yet the lives and testimonies of these simple Protestant believers and, often, martyrs were not without power.²² In fact, during the spring and summer of 1554 the congregations in many of the cities of France continued to grow despite, and in some cases as a direct result of, increasing persecutions.

Calvin, throughout these years, maintained a faithful correspondence with certain of the congregations. At the end of the summer of 1554, he wrote a letter of advice and exhortation to his brethren in the province of Poitou in western France. The text of this letter is very characteristic of his French correspondence of these years. He exhorts them to their double duty of assembling together in holy, secret meetings and yet of publicly professing the Gospel without fear or dissimulation. He also advises them to follow up any sympathy or openness

manifested by any of the noble or aristocratic class. Finally, he warns them to observe in their speaking and acting that delicate balance between caution and boldness which is divinely ordained and must be maintained.²³

At the close of the summer of 1555 the Protestant congregation in Paris elected a minister and chose elders (anciens) and deacons (diacres). Thus the Church of Paris was formally constituted "in all respects conforming to the example of the primitive Church in the time of the Apostles."²⁴ In the formation of their consistory, the Protestants of Paris followed the organizational model recommended by Calvin in his Institutes of the Christian Religion.²⁵ Before the end of the year, churches had been organized in Meaux, Angers, Loudun, Poitiers and a number of other cities. In almost each instance a minister was sent from Paris or Geneva to assist in the formal organization. As a result the form of organization adopted by these churches was very similar to that of the Church of Paris with the "consistoire" as the basic unit.

The persecutions continued without abating during the months of organization and on into the following year. Calvin's counsel was still to assemble secretly and continue unobtrusive evangelization. 1556 and the first half of 1557 was a period of further Protestant ecclesiastical activity. New churches were established and the number of pastors dispatched from Geneva increased sharply.²⁶ Of course there were setbacks mixed with advances for the Protestant cause in 1557.

In the second week of August, 1557, the French forces of Henry II met the Spanish troops of Philip II in the Battle of Saint Quentin on the northern border of France. The French were completely defeated, St. Quentin was captured and Gaspard of Coligny, First Admiral of France, was captured and imprisoned by the Spanish.²⁷ For the Protestant cause there were serious direct results. In Paris the rumor developed that somehow Protestant sedition and treachery had been responsible for the defeat. This rumor led to strong anti-Protestant feeling in the city and ultimately to the anti-Protestant incident known as the "Affair of rue St. -Jacques."²⁸

On the evening of September 4 between three and four hundred persons of all ages and social levels gathered in a building on the rue St. -Jacques near the Sorbonne. An alarm was turned in by several of the more zealous and suspicious of the Catholic authorities of the university. The building was surrounded by armed men and a large, unruly crowd. Some of the Protestant worshippers escaped safely, while those that remained were finally arrested and led to prison amidst a torrent of vocal and physical abuse from the crowd. This incident led to mobilization of forces on the part of both Protestants and Catholics.²⁹

The "Affair of rue St. -Jacques" is a very convenient and appropriate point on which to divide a discussion of the final four years of the reign of Henry II. The first two years of widespread ecclesiastical organization were completed. Henry's dreams of a convincing victory over the forces of Philip II of Spain were shattered at St. Quentin. The popular indignation and suspicion against the Protestants in Paris materialized with brutal harshness in the arrests of September 4. Finally, this "Affair" and events in the following three months vividly

illustrated the increasing importance of the aristocratic or noble element within the ranks of those Frenchmen who professed and sympathized with the Reformed Faith.

Penetration of the Upper Classes

The "Affair of rue St.-Jacques" was directed against the Protestant congregation of the capital of the nation. Several of its pastors were noblemen, Francis de Morel and Antoine de la Roche-Chandieu, and the persons arrested included men and women of distinguished rank. These developments served to intensify the feeling of the king and his court that the Protestants were rapidly becoming an organized group capable of political as well as religious activities and purpose.³⁰ Calvin displayed the same awareness in his words of explicit caution addressed to the congregation in Paris:

And indeed better it were all involved in ruin, than that the gospel of God should be exposed to the reproach of aiming men to sedition and tumult; for God will always cause the ashes of his servants to fructify, but excesses and violence will bring with them nothing but barrenness.³¹

By its numerical growth alone the Protestant movement was assuming alarming proportions in foreign as well as French estimation.³² Lucien Romier estimates that by 1558 "there is room to believe that one-third of the inhabitants of the kingdom had been detached from the Roman Church."³³ It is not, however, legitimate to presume that all of these disaffected persons were actually active members of Reformed churches.

In Paris the believers were becoming increasingly bold and crowds of persons began collecting regularly in a public area of the Sorbonne and there joined together in the singing of psalms which had been translated into French by Clement Marot earlier in the century. These crowds regularly included members of the highest nobility.

Henry II, already suspicious of the activities of many of the nobles and even of the "Princes of the Blood," was led to consider these gatherings seditious and conspiratorial. He declared them illegal and the Reformed leaders advised their brethren to observe the royal order.³⁴ Nevertheless, Antoine of Bourbon, the first "Prince of the Blood," and his younger brother, Louis of Condé, were now known as protectors of the Calvinist population.

Very shortly thereafter another leading family was dramatically identified with the Protestant cause. The family of Coligny of the House of Chatillon was committed through the activities and profession of Francis of Coligny, Lord of Andelot. In the spring of 1558 this young man, who was the colonel in charge of all infantry within the borders of France, was attacked and denounced by the Cardinal of Lorraine. D'Andelot was called before the king to face a four-fold charge of complicity with the outlawed Protestants. He frankly admitted the truth of the charge, but maintained his loyalty to the crown. He was immediately arrested and imprisoned in Melun to the south of Paris.³⁵ He remained firm in his confession and carried on an amazing correspondence with the Protestant leaders in Paris and in Geneva.³⁶

D'Andelot had admitted before the king that he had transmitted books printed in Geneva

to his brother, Admiral Coligny, while the latter was imprisoned by the Spanish. Admiral Coligny had earlier shown definite sympathies with the Reformed beliefs. Then, languishing in a Spanish prison and reading the books sent by his younger brother, he found the faith and certainty which was to carry him through to his infamous death in 1572 as the most consistent and righteous of the Protestant military and political leaders.³⁷ Thus the Chatillon brothers, nephews of Constable Montmorency, were publicly identified as adherents and protectors "de la religion."

The condition of the nobility in France at this time gives these professions special significance. Economic changes as well as other changes during the sixteenth century had drastically undermined the position of the vast majority of the noble class. As a result the mass of the French nobility began to turn from dependence upon the crown in search of other objects for its allegiance. The natural alternatives were the great lords and the great noble families of the realm.³⁹ The Houses of Bourbon, Guise, Montmorency and the related House of Chatillon were the greatest of these feudal families. At this very time, as shown in the preceding discussion, the leading members of two of these four families were professing the "new doctrines."

While these events were taking place in Paris and among the nobles of the kingdom, the evangelization of France continued at an accelerated pace. In the years 1558 and 1559, the number of pastors dispatched from Geneva reached its peak.⁴⁰ There were notable conversions among the Catholic clerical and monastic ranks.⁴¹ New churches were organized in many more towns and cities.⁴² A national synod or assembly of all the Reformed pastors to agree upon "a common statement of doctrine and discipline, conformable to the word of God" was now ready to be proposed.⁴³ This synod convened on May 26, 1559, in the midst of the hearings and investigations in the Parlement of Paris. A confession of faith and an ecclesiastical discipline were composed which are worthy of close study.

The confession of faith is in many respects similar to the statement which Calvin formulated and sent to Henry II in October, 1557.⁴⁴ There is expressed the distinction and balance between obedience to earthly authority and heavenly authority.⁴⁵ In the final two articles the principle of civil obedience is firmly defined. Furthermore it is stated that those of the Reformed Faith "detest all those who do reject the Higher Powers" and who advocate communal holding of possessions and goods and who subvert justice.⁴⁶

The ecclesiastical discipline is detailed and very strict in its terms. Especially severe are measures directed against anyone who caused scandal or sedition to be charged against the church by violating in any way civil regulations. However, while the civil magistrate's authority is emphasized, the ecclesiastical magistrate is declared to be without authority or power.⁴⁷

The bequest of this initial national assembly is considerable. It includes a confession of faith adopted with unanimous approval, a detailed and strict church discipline, and finally the highly successful ecclesiastical structure based on the consistory. It is this structural hierarchy which is said to have shown special adaptability to political, military and financial, as well as religious organization.⁴⁸

The rumors of the secret meetings of the national synod in Paris and the clear indications of the continued growth and expansion of Protestantism in every part of the realm convinced Henry II that even more drastic steps were required to stem and to eradicate the heresy. That he planned to take such steps is certain.

"The King of France is dead!" On June 30, 1559, a splinter from a shattered lance accidentally entered the king's forehead. The freak injury occurred in a tournament held in honor of the much heralded marriages between the French and Spanish royal families. After ten fateful days Henry II died and three years of crisis were inaugurated which were followed by nearly four decades of civil war.⁴⁹

The last half of the reign of Henry II were years in which French Protestantism assumed a new internal composition and organization which served to frighten the royal and Catholic authorities and, at the same time, to greatly embolden the growing number of Protestants within France.

CONSPIRACY -- PRELUDE TO CIVIL WAR 1559-1560

The changes and developments which we have described and analyzed thus far gave to the French Protestant movement a potential for political action which began to be realized and explored during the short reign of Francis II. With regard to religious movements in general and French Protestantism in particular, Edward Armstrong has formulated a basic principle:

Every great religious or spiritual movement is likely, sooner or later, to take a political direction. It will associate with itself the aspirations and the grievances of classes which are oppressed; it will serve as a help, more often as a hindrance, to the actual government.⁵⁰

Francis II ascended the throne as an adolescent in his fifteenth year. He inherited a kingdom which was far from untroubled. The spread of the Protestant heresy was reaching dangerous proportions. The heretics hailed the death of his father as a definite act of God's hand on their behalf.⁵¹ The young king's mental and physical constitution was not overly strong. His wife was the beautiful Mary, Queen of Scots, a niece of the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorraine. The control of the king by these two men was early established. The mother of the king, Catherine de Medicis, appeared to be in a prominent position but not yet strong enough to oppose the influence of the Guise brothers.⁵²

The King of Navarre's behavior at court in September, 1559, was very disappointing for many of his supporters. In return for vague promises about the future of his holdings in Navarre, he agreed with the Guises not to force the issues of the king's minority, his regency and the convocation of the Estates-General.⁵³ This caused many of the Protestants and other anti-Guise elements to put their hopes and confidence in his younger brother, Louis of Bourbon, Lord of Condé. This ambitious young prince possessed only a little money and property but he was rich in boldness. The rising feeling against the Guise administration stimulated definite plans in which Louis of Condé was deeply involved.⁵⁴ There is little doubt that a significant amount of this discontent was due to the way in which the Guise family was domi-

nating Francis II to the exclusion of the Bourbon, Montmorency, and Chatillon families.⁵⁵

With the Guise brothers in power, the persecutions aimed at the Protestants increased in intensity and extent. In the midst of these terrible persecutions, Calvin wrote to the brethren in Paris and in the whole country to remind them that persecutions were from the Lord and thus were designed to try the believer's constancy and his firmness of faith. Trials, even bitter ones, were not to be avoided or resisted with physical force.⁵⁶

Nevertheless, inspired and supported by Louis of Condé, the actual organizational work of a complex conspiracy was placed in the hands of an individual called Jehan du Barry, Lord of Renaudie. He traveled in many parts of France seeking to gain noble support for a military attempt to free the young king from the domination of the Guise family. He used a familiar line of argument based on the need for the king to be directed by the "Princes of the Blood" and for an assembling of the Estates-General.⁵⁷ Renaudie also traveled extensively outside of France contacting French nobles in exile. After several months of careful planning the stage was set.

In the spring of 1560 the "Conspiracy of Amboise" was put into operation. An attempt was made to seize the king and his court and to arrest the Guise brothers. The latter had been warned and the attempt was foiled. A large number of the conspirators were arrested and many, including Renaudie, were killed or executed immediately. Despite the very bloody and successful repression of the conspiracy by the Guises, much of their confidence was shaken by the whole affair. Louis of Condé was implicated in the conspiracy, but cleared himself in a dramatic audience before the king himself by a bold denial of any involvement.

The purpose of the conspiracy was defended as having been completely loyal to the king's person and to the legitimate estate of the kingdom, having been aimed solely at the "usurping foreigners."⁵⁸ Yet the whole affair served perfectly in the hands of the opponents of the Reformed Faith to confirm the charges of sedition and conspiracy which had been made repeatedly against the Protestants. Though Calvin protested his innocence, the pastors from Geneva had been implicated.⁵⁹

The term "Huguenot" came into very common use right at this time and was never dropped. Whatever its origins, the term had definite political overtones and thus may stand for the political appearance and character which the Protestant movement assumed through the Conspiracy of Amboise and subsequent events.

In hopes of quelling these uprisings and various literary attacks on the court and of preventing civil war, the Guises, Catherine de Medicis and L'Hospital, the new Chancellor, decided to call the Estates-General to meet in December, 1560, and a meeting of the nation's religious authorities for the following month. Almost immediately new Protestant and anti-Guisard agitation broke out.⁶⁰ Provoked by such outbreaks, Francis II and the Guises summoned Antoine of Bourbon and Louis of Condé to appear at the court in Orleans where the Estates-General were scheduled to meet in December. When Antoine and Condé arrived in Orleans, Condé was arrested and Antoine was placed under virtual house-arrest. The game seemed to be up when Condé was tried and condemned to death on November 26.⁶¹

Suddenly the "boy-king" fell critically ill and on the night of December 4, Francis II died. The next day his younger brother, Charles IX, was declared King of France.⁶² To the Protestants the death of Francis II seemed to be the work of a merciful God even more clearly than the death of his father. The execution of Condé was postponed and the Protestants realized that Antoine of Bourbon was in the best possible position to assume full control of the situation and of the country. However, Antoine ceded his "right-to-regency" to Catherine de Medicis in return for some assurance about his possessions as King of Navarre.⁶³ The splendid opportunity was lost and the destiny of France was placed into the eager hands of the devious Catherine.

The short reign of Francis II was a time of varying fortunes as far as the Huguenots were concerned. Through all these events and the uncertainty of the situation, the political inclinations and interests of the French Protestants were encouraged to develop. Among the common people the believers continued to grow in number and were led into bolder, iconoclastic activities. The Protestant leaders were led to put a growing confidence in the roles played by certain great nobles who came to represent Protestant interests. The "political Huguenots" were encouraged to conspiratorial activities by the continued numerical growth of the Protestant party, the affiliation of certain great nobles with the movement, the rising wave of anti-Guisard feeling throughout the nation, and the fluid and unstable condition of the throne. This period of conspiracy was indeed a prelude to devastating civil war.

CONCLUSION

The Protestant party in the years before 1553 was primarily a persecuted religious minority group. It faced the opposition of both civil and religious authorities. Its adherents submitted passively to severe persecutions and libelous slanders due entirely to their profession of the Reformed Faith. By the end of 1560, the Reformed Church in France presented a very formidable appearance to Catholic and royal authorities as a result of the developments discussed previously. The movement's numbers had increased greatly and it now possessed an efficient religious administrative organization at all levels which obviously could be adapted to serve political, military, and financial purposes. It was directed by dozens of ministers trained in Geneva and through Calvin it had contacts with strong foreign governments whose sympathy and willingness to intervene diplomatically had been manifested time after time. Finally the movement had established itself among several of the leading families in France and had the support of a large portion of the lesser French nobility, who combined to attempt to dislodge the ruling Guise family from its place of power behind the throne of the king. Among the bitter fruits of this development and transformation of the Protestant party were more than three decades of the most terrible civil strife in the history of France, and, ultimately, the virtual extinction of Protestantism in France.

DOCUMENTATION

1. Franklin C. Palm, Politics and Religion in Sixteenth-Century France (Boston: Ginn and Co., 1927), pp. 1-2.
2. Palm, Calvinism and the Religious Wars (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1932), I, pp. 35-37.
3. Louis Batiffol, The Century of the Renaissance, Buckley, E. F., trans. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1916), pp. 43-82.
4. Lucien Romier, Les Origines Politiques des Guerres de Religion (Paris: Librairie Academique, 1914), II, pp. 290-293.
5. Edward Armstrong, The French Wars of Religion (London: B. H. Blackwell, 1904), pp. 33-34.
6. Ibid., p. 13.
7. Robert M. Kingdon, Geneva and the Coming of the Wars of Religion in France (Geneva: E. Droz, 1956), pp. 1-2.
8. Caleb G. Kelly, "French Protestantism, 1559-1562," Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, XXXIII, No. 4, 1918, pp. 15, 34-35.
9. Henry M. Baird, History of the Rise of the Huguenots of France (New York: Charles Scribner Sons, 1879), I, pp. 41-42.
Preserved Smith, The Age of the Reformation (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1920), pp. 182-185.
10. Baird, op. cit., I, pp. 99-109.
11. Thomas M. Lindsay, A History of the Reformation (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916), II, p. 141.
12. C. Coignet, La Reforme Française avant les guerres civiles, 1512-1559 (Paris: Fischbacher, 1890), pp. 36-51.
13. Emile and Eugene Haag, La France Protestants ou Vies des Protestants Français (Paris: Bureau de la Publication, 1846), I, p. 1.
14. Coignet, op. cit., pp. 78-92.
15. Nathanael Weiss, La Chambre Ardente, étude sur la liberté de conscience en France sous François I et Henri II, 1540-1550 (Paris: Fischbacher, 1889), pp. 1-55.
16. Baird, Theodore Beza, The Counsellor of the French Reformation, 1519-1605 (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1899), pp. 32-37.
17. Baird, History of the Huguenots, I, pp. 253-256.
G. Baum and E. Cunitz, eds., Histoire ecclésiastique des églises réformées au royaume de France (Paris: Fischbacher, 1883), I, pp. 49-53.
18. E. Castel, Les Huguenots et la Constitution de l'Eglise Reformée de France en 1559 (Paris and Geneva: Grassart and Bérout, 1859), pp. 1-119.
19. Armstrong, op. cit., p. 48.
20. Romier, Le Royaume de Catherine de Médicis, la France à la vielle des guerres de religion (Paris: Librairie Academique, 1922), II, p. 225.
21. Palm, Politics and Religion, p. 3.
22. Baum and Cunitz, op. cit., I, p. 88.
23. Jules Bonnet, ed., Letters of John Calvin, Marcus R. Gilchrist, trans. (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1858), III, pp. 68-71.

24. Baum and Cunitz, op. cit., I, p. 98.
25. Ibid., pp. 97-100.
Alexandre Crottet, Petite Chronique Protestante de France ou documents historiques sur les églises reformées de ce royaume (Paris and Geneva: A. Cherbuliez, 1846), pp. 155-160.
26. Kingdon, op. cit., p. 145.
27. Jacques-Auguste de Thou, Histoire Universelle (La Haye: Scheurleer, 1740), II, pp. 507-525.
28. Baird, History of the Huguenots, I, pp. 301-303.
29. Jean Crespin, Histoire des Martyrs persécutés et mis à mort pour la vérité de l'évangile, depuis le temps des apostres jusques a présent, 1619 (Toulouse: Société des Livres Religieux, 1887), II, pp. 542-584.
Crottet, op. cit., pp. 161-176.
30. Baum and Cunitz, op. cit., I, pp. 116-131.
Thou, op. cit., II, pp. 530-532.
31. Bonnet, op. cit., III, pp. 359-363.
32. Tommaseo, Niccolo, ed. and trans., Relations des Ambassadeurs Vénétiens sur les affaires de France au XVI siècle. Collection de Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France, publiés par ordre du Roi et par les soins du Ministre de Publique, Première Série, Histoire Politique, No. 47 (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1838), I, pp. 411-417.
33. Romier, Les Origines, II, p. 251.
34. Crespin, op. cit., II, pp. 584-590.
35. Crottet, op. cit., pp. 183-184.
Baum and Cunitz, op. cit., I, p. 144.
36. Bonnet, op. cit., III, pp. 437-438, 445.
37. Crottet, op. cit., p. 179.
38. Baum and Cunitz, op. cit., I, pp. 113-114.
39. Romier, Le Royaume, I, pp. 160-181, 188-222.
Kelly, op. cit., p. 12.
40. Kingdon, op. cit., p. 145.
41. Crottet, op. cit., pp. 179-180.
42. Baum and Cunitz, op. cit., I, pp. 155-166.
43. Ibid., pp. 171-172.
44. Bonnet, op. cit., III, p. 372.
45. John Quick, Synodicon in Gallia Reformata: or, The Acts, Decisions, Decrees, and Canons of the Reformed Churches in France (London: Three Bibles and Crown, 1692), I, p. xii.
46. Ibid., p. xv.
47. Ibid., p. ix-lvi.
48. Armstrong, op. cit., pp. 3, 6.
49. William B. Turnbull, ed., Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Mary, 1553-1558 (London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1861), pp. 370-372.
50. Armstrong, op. cit., p. 1.
51. Joseph Stevenson, ed., Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1558-1559 (London: Longman, Green, Longman and Roberts, 1863-1865), p. 345.

52. Kelly, op. cit., p. 12.
Romier, La Conjuration d'Amboise, l'Aurore Sanglante de la Liberté de Conscience, le Règne et la Mort de François II (Paris: Librairie Académique, 1923), pp. 7-8.
53. Ibid., pp. 23-29.
54. Ibid., pp. 10-16.
55. Pierre de La Place, Commentaires de l'Estat de la Religion et République sous les Rois Henri et François seconds, et Charles neuvieme (unknown: 1565), pp. 42-43.
56. Bonnet, op. cit., IV, pp. 80-87.
57. Romier, La Conjuration, pp. 31-45.
58. Louis I de Bourbon de Condé, Mémoires de Condé, servant d'éclaircissement et de preuves a l'Histoire de M. de Thou, contenant ce qui s'est passé mémorable en Europe (London and Paris: Rollin, 1743), I, pp. 360-367.
59. Kingdon, op. cit., pp. 68-76.
60. Romier, La Conjuration, pp. 215-231.
Thou, op. cit., II, pp. 808-821.
61. La Place, op. cit., pp. 111-115.
Romier, La Conjuration, pp. 266-276.
62. Ibid., pp. 277-288.
63. Baird, History of the Huguenots, I, 442-444.

HERMENEUTICAL PRINCIPLES AND CREATION THEORIES

GARY G. COHEN

INTRODUCTION

Since Charles Darwin had his Origin of the Species published in 1859, following by a century Astruc's 1753 book on the sources of Genesis, the two forces of evolution and higher criticism have placed the Genesis creation account under great scrutiny and attack. During this attack it has been alarming to see the principles of interpretation used by liberals and some so-called conservatives in an attempt to arrive at interpretations which are compatible to the views of skeptics. At the same time, there have been so many schemes of understanding the structure of the Genesis 1:1-2:3 portion, that all true lovers of God's Word may well give pause to consider the hermeneutical principles governing all Scripture and particularly this section of it.

In order to facilitate this consideration, this paper offers: (1) a set of rules for properly interpreting the creation narrative, and (2) summaries of the leading theories on the creation of Genesis 1:1-2:3.

This is written with belief that the Psalmist was correct when he declared, "For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven" (Psa. 119:89); that Christ was right in saying, ". . . the scripture cannot be broken" (John 10:35); and that Paul spoke the truth to Timothy as he penned, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God . . ." (2 Tim. 3:16). Some day when our goal of glory is reached, when we no longer "see through a glass darkly" (I Cor. 13:12), and when the true scientific facts of cosmology will be known and unhampered by false opinions of unbelievers (I Tim. 6:20-21), then all shall see that the Mosaic creation narrative is indeed inspired of God and entirely accurate! Until that great day, let us pray that God's truth might be better apprehended by all who love His word.

SECTION I

HERMENEUTICAL PRINCIPLES AND THE CREATION ACCOUNT

The following thirteen principles combine those which have become the heritage of true Protestantism through Augustine and the Reformers together with some original and newly worded ones. The originality, however, is severely limited as even the so-called newer

principles are built squarely upon the thoughts of others. If all interpreters would uniformly adopt these suggestions there still would not be perfect agreement in Christendom, but a large step would have been taken towards both agreement and discovering the truth. As it has been sometimes said, "Interpretation is both a science and an art;"--usage of these rules would make the science more reliable and would restrict the art to the limits of the canvas. It must also be noted that the closer students come to understanding God's revelation perfectly, the more beautiful that revelation becomes. Human theories as far as they differ from God's truth, that much mar the beauty of the picture. These principles are designed to enable the interpreter to better unveil the wonder and glorious majesty of the creation.

The Thirteen Principles

1. Inspired

The creation account, Gen. 1:1-2:3, being part of Holy Scripture, is to be taken as inspired of God, and therefore, thoroughly trustworthy and accurate in its original autographs (2 Tim. 3:16).

As with all of God's word, it is inerrant in fact, judgment, and doctrine. Thus, whenever the Bible treads in the realms of history and science in this narration of first things, it is infallible and without error in these areas. Its cosmological, geological and anthropological teachings are just as accurate as its religious teachings. See the twelfth principle for further support of this point.

It is the unanimous declaration of the Old Testament Torah, Prophets, and Writings, as well as of Christ, Paul, and all of the New Testament writers that Scripture is entirely God's message and free from all error. Among the myriad of Biblical passages to support this are: 2 Tim. 3:16; 2 Pet. 1:20-21; John 10:34, 35; 1 Pet. 1:10-12; and Heb. 1:1, 2. Therefore, Gen. 1:1-2:3, a keystone of the Bible, must above all be treated as inspired revelation given to us through Moses from a God who cannot lie (Num. 23:19).

2. Guidance of the Holy Spirit

The guidance of the Holy Spirit is a sine qua non to true interpretation.

This guidance is commonly referred to as "illumination." This truth is taught by such Scriptures as 1 Cor. 2:14-16; 2 Pet. 1:20, 21; and Dan. 2:27-30.

3. Grammatico-Historical Method

The Grammatico-Historical Method must be used.

Dr. Homer Kent, Sr. in the Grace Theological Seminary Postgraduate Seminar of Feb. 6, 1964, defined this method as follows:

The grammatico-historical method of interpretation is that method which

seeks to find by the use of the laws of grammar, the study of the context and connection of a given passage of Scripture, the intrinsic meaning of the words used, and the author's historical standpoint, etc.--that is, the intended meaning of Scripture.

4. Literal

"Any term should be regarded as literal until there is a good reason for a different understanding."¹

This is the literal principle which flows naturally out of the grammatico-historical method. While it recognizes the use of figurative language, it forbids the turning of historical narrative, be it in prose or poetry, into allegory when the writer did not originally so intend it.

5. Scripture Interprets Scripture

"Scripture is its own best interpreter!"

Since the Bible is an inspired unity, portions which deal with the same subject supplement and illumine one another. No interpretation is really complete until it has considered parallel passages and related references. Just as the many lights above a surgical table prevent shadows, so other portions of God's word enlighten many dark spots not touched by the portion at hand.

Two sub-principles further guide the rule that Scripture interprets Scripture. They are: (a) the clear governs the obscure; and (b) the specific governs the general. An example of this latter assertion would be that the specific account of the creation of the first pair, Adam and Eve in Genesis 2, explains the details of the general declaration of the creation of man in Gen. 1:27. The specific governs the general because it restricts the interpretational latitude of the general truth to the narrower compass of the specific declaration. Thus, without Gen. 2 and related passages, from Gen. 1:27 alone there would be much room for speculation as to how God created mankind, but with the specific account of Gen. 2, Gen. 1:27 is reduced to only the interpretation which Gen. 2 yields. Likewise, Rev. 20:4, 5, with its specific teaching concerning the two resurrections, governs the interpretation of Dan. 12:2 with its general view of the resurrection of all men.

6. Language of Appearance

Interpreters must remember that the Bible describes natural phenomena geocentrically, anthropocentrically, and in the language of appearance.²

This principle, however, does not in any way mean that Scripture contains error in fact or judgment, for the biblical description is always accurate and true in every particular.

According to this principle it is observed that the animals made by God on the fifth and

sixth days are described just as a man upon the earth would see them. The waters, sky, and land are seen to teem prolifically with living creatures. The Hebrew words used to describe the various forms of life do not each point to one certain species or class of present day taxonomic classification, but in the language of appearance they each point to a group having a common external resemblance. Edwin Gedney of Gordon College, who adheres to the Age Day Theory of the creation, gives the following suggestions as to the meanings of the Hebrew terms for the animals listed in Gen. 1. He writes, concerning Gen. 1:20-25, as follows:

Moving creatures - Hebrew nephesh chayyah. . . . The idea of movement is derived from the Hebrew sherets [v. 20] which has the significance of swarms or an active mass of moving animals. A more literal translation of the first phrase of verse 20 might be given as follows: "And God said, Let the seas swarm (swarms of) living creatures." . . .

Fowl - Hebrew oph. This has the significance of "That which covereth with wings," a flying creature. The flying creatures with which the Hebrew commonly had to do were the birds, but the word could also signify any other flyer such as reptiles or mammals.

Whales - Literally sea monsters. Hebrew hattanninim. Descriptive of the great reptilian and elasmobranch forms in the sea.

Living creatures - See "Moving creatures" above. Signifies breathing creatures or that which has breath or life [v. 21].

Cattle - Hebrew behemah. Any large quadrupedal animal principally of mammalian type. Sometimes in the plural, specifically used of the hippopotamus.

Creepers - The idea of creepers in verses 24 and 25 is derived from the Hebrew ramas which signifies "to creep, crawl, or glide swiftly." It can be used of a reptile, or any other animal that crawls or moves rapidly with very short steps.

Beasts of the earth - This included in the mind of the Hebrew many mammalian organisms of the nondomestic type. The carnivores, for example, would belong here.³

The point is that in Gen. 1 "fowl" would include flying creatures of all classes, Reptilia, Aves, and all others. In like manner, "sea monsters," "whales" in the KJV, must not be limited to the Pisces, fish, but may well comprehend also large air breathing creatures such as dinosaurs which trudge along with their heavy bodies below the water's surface while their heads breathe the coastal air. Perhaps, however, the dinosaurs would best be included among the "cattle" or "beasts." In any event, the Genesis terms cover all major appearance classes, and are certainly intended to take in every created creature which came upon the earth.

7. Human Theories

Human inferences and theories on matters and details upon which Scripture is silent are not to be viewed with the same eye of certainty as are the plain teachings of Scripture itself.

John 21:25 points to a truth which is also relevant to the creation account when it says,

And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they

should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written.

Thus, while Scripture is complete in the sense that it says all that God desired to have written in it and is sufficient to clearly lead all to God and to do His service aright, it yet is not complete in the sense that it records every detail concerning every event in the universe. What it says is true, but it does not say everything. This is especially true in the creation account. To seek for illumination concerning what God has revealed is proper; to seek for additional revelation is presumptuous. Therefore, in this present age it must be realized that all of our curiosities cannot be answered by Scripture's sure authority. Many of these questions can only at best be answered by human opinions, and these, it must be observed, often err.

8. Human Reasoning, as a Source of Revelation Is Rejected

A Christian must look to the Bible only as a source of infallible revelation; he must not look to human reasoning or human science for inerrant truth.

Sound exegesis must determine one's findings, rather than a desire to make scriptural teachings conform to the current consensus of secular scientific cosmological theory. It is a false theory of Double Revelation to look to men who hold anti-supernatural and uniformitarian presuppositions for inerrant guidance in interpreting Genesis.

This may be reasoned in the following manner:

(1) Since the theories and conclusions of secular science in the areas of prehistoric anthropology, paleontology, geology, and cosmology are experimentally and testimonially (except for the testimony of Scripture) unverifiable; and (2) since they are based on anti-supernatural presuppositions (which we know to be false for God does exist, has created, and has and does providentially by second causes and miraculous intervention govern His world) and uniformitarian presuppositions (which we know to be false for God has intervened in the world of nature at the creation, Gen. 1, 2; at the Fall, Gen. 3:14-19; at the Flood, Gen. 6-9; Num. 16, etc.; (3) therefore these secular theories and conclusions are unreliable interpretational guides (2 Pet. 3:3-6; 1 Tim. 6:20; Matt. 22:29).

9. Biblical Words

Biblical words are to be interpreted according to the hermeneutical rules governing their definitions, equivalents, and connotations.

These rules are, --

(1) Biblical words are to be defined according to the Grammatico-Historical method. According to this method usus loquendi and context, not etymology, determine a word's meaning.

(2) Biblical words are to be understood as not being necessarily identical with words of

similar area in present scientific terminology. (E.g., the Hebrew word "kind," min - מין - of Gen. 1 is not identical to "species" of present day taxonomy.)

(3) Biblical words may not be presumed to have the same connotation in any given location as they have in another. This must be decided by evidence. (E.g., because tohu and bohu, "without form and void," are used in Jer. 4:23 in a judgment context, it may not be presumed without proof that these words always carry a judgment connotation, and hence in Gen. 1:2 signify per se the results of a divine judgment.)

10. Time Gaps

Conclusions relating to time gaps must accord with the rules of evidence, logic, and the teachings of Scripture.

Rules which govern time gap interpretations are as follows:

(1) Time gaps are an a priori possibility. (As there are time gaps in prophetic revelations of the future, e.g., Dan. 12:2, cf. Rev. 20:4, 5; Dan. 9:25-27 between the 69th and 70th weeks; etc., so there might be a time gap (or gaps) in the Genesis 1 prophetic revelation of the past!)

(2) Time gaps, therefore, must not be dogmatically denied or affirmed in any given place without exegetical proof that in that place a gap is either impossible or a necessity.

(3) Time gaps which are "probable" or "improbable" cannot be dogmatically affirmed or denied.

(4) Time gaps, where evidence is not conclusive, must await further light to be either established or eliminated.

11. Pagan Cosmogonies

Pagan cosmogonies cannot be used as interpretational guides.

While additional enlightenment upon the interpretation of the creation account may be had through extra-biblical studies, pagan cosmogonies such as the gross Babylonian Enuma Elish, being uninspired, cannot be used as hermeneutical guides. Thus it cannot be maintained that the Genesis account probably teaches something because Enuma Elish teaches it--many modernists to the contrary notwithstanding (e.g., Ralph Elliott⁴).

12. Historical Not Mythological

The narrative must be interpreted as a real historical occurrence.

The Genesis 1:1-2:3 account, in harmony with Principle 5 which declares that "Scripture Interprets Scripture," must be taken as relating history. Christ took the supernatural

events of Genesis to be historical, and not as myth or allegory (Matt. 19:4; 24:37-39; Luke 17:32); and He of all men should know the truth of the matter since He was there when it happened (John 1:1-3). The writers of Scripture everywhere take the creation story historically (Heb. 11:3; John 1:1-3; Psalms 8:3; 19:1; Exodus 20:11; Acts 17:24; 2 Peter 3:5; etc.).

13. Abrupt Decisions Are To Be Avoided

Abrupt decisions concerning debatable matters should be avoided.

On this topic Augustine's wise words are yet to be heeded. He wrote,

. . . if we find anything in Divine Scripture which may be variously explained without injury to faith we should not rush headlong, by positive assertion, either to one opinion or the other; lest, if perchance the opinion we have adopted should afterwards turn out to be false, our faith should fall with; and we should be found contending, not so much for the doctrine of the Sacred Scripture as for our own; endeavouring to make our doctrine to be that of the Scriptures, instead of taking the doctrine of the Scriptures to be ours.⁵

Aquinas commented likewise when speaking on the first chapter of Genesis. He related,

. . . in questions of this sort there are two things to be observed. First, that the truth of Scripture be inviolably maintained. Secondly, since Scripture doth admit of diverse interpretations, that no one cling to any particular exposition with such pertinacity that, if what he supposed to be the teaching of Scripture, should afterwards turn out to be clearly false, he should nevertheless still presume to put it forward, lest thereby the Sacred Scripture should be exposed to the derision of unbelievers, and the way of salvation should be closed to them.⁶

SECTION II

CREATION THEORIES

In conjunction with the consideration of the hermeneutical laws which govern the interpretation of the creation account, it is worthwhile to consider the interpretational schemes which have been applied to it by different parties throughout the ages. The following theories are variously explained and are known under sundry titles. They are capable of being combined so that in reality there exist a great number of possible combinations. It is here hoped that thought might be provoked which will point to the truth.

It should also be remembered that the plausibility of various theories largely depends on who explains them. Thus many will say in glory, "But I never heard it explained in quite that way!"

Each of the following are here treated in only outline form as the arguments pro and con for each, with a thorough discussion of the problems involved, could dispose of more than one volume per theory. The chief theories advanced are as follows:

Group One: Theories Which Treat the Genesis Account As
Literal, Inspired and Accurate in Details

1. Theories Concerning the Grammatical Construction of Gen. 1:1-3

The interpreter may construe Gen. 1:1 in four primary ways:

(1) As an independent clause which is part of the narrative. It then contains the teaching of God's creating ex nihilo the heavens and the earth, i.e., the entire universe with its mass and energy. This is the traditional interpretation. It is supported by the context and by other Scripture. Heb. 11:3 and John 1:1-3, as well as the Bible as a whole, clearly teach creation ex nihilo!

(2) As a dependent clause subordinate to Gen. 1:2. Thus, Gen. 1:1, 2a would be translated, "When God began to create the heaven and the earth, the earth was without form and void."⁷ Ibn Ezra held this view.⁸

(3) As a dependent clause subordinate to Gen. 1:3. Here Gen. 1:2 is either taken as a parenthetical element or as coupled to Gen. 1:1 by the waw. Rashi and some others held this.⁹ The translation would be, "When God began to create . . . then God said, 'Let there be light.'"¹⁰

(4) As a headline sentence which is not part of the narrative per se. On the fallaciousness of this interpretation as well as on the two above listed "dependent clause" views, J. Barton Payne writes,

The summary statement in Gen. 2:1, which indicates the completion of heaven and earth, demands that Gen. 1:1 be considered as a part of the narrative on the sequence of creation; for otherwise there would be no verse descriptive of the creation of heaven. Gen. 1:1 may, therefore, not be treated as a mere title prefixed to the chapter. Neither may it be subordinated to verse 2. This latter and more dangerous rendering, that is advocated by liberalism, produces the translation, "When God began to create heaven and earth, then the earth was formless . . ." (RSV note), which suggests the prior, eternal existence of unformed matter.¹¹

Thus, the true interpretation, which sees Gen. 1:1 as an independent clause which is part of the narrative of creation, teaches in harmony with other Scriptures that God brought the universe forth out of no pre-existing material. This interpretation must be combined with choices from among the theories that follow in order for a complete interpretational scheme to be formulated.

2. Theories Concerning a Time Gap Between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2

(1) Non-Judgment Gap Theory

This theory sees Gen. 1:1 as descriptive of the original creation of the material universe. Then a vast time gap is seen between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2 (or between 1:2 and 1:3). The first of the six creative days is taken as beginning at 1:3 or at 1:2 rather than at Gen. 1:1. This is thought to harmonize well with the four and one-half billion year age of the universe advocated by many. This theory may be combined with another theory which concerns itself with the length of the creative days. Thus one could hold this theory and also believe in literal 24-hour creation days or in creation days which are millions of years long.

Augustine held this Non-Judgment Gap Theory.¹²

(2) Reconstruction, Restitution, or Gap Theory

This is advocated by the Scofield Reference Bible.¹³ Thomas Chalmers seems to have been its first advocate. Through various arguments (the verb in Gen. 1:2, hayah, is taken to mean "became" instead of the KJV's "was;" Jer. 4:23-26, Isa. 24:1, 45:18, and Ezek. 28:12-19 are understood to show that tohu and bohu, "without form and void," are the result of a divine judgment; this provides a place for the fall of Satan which had to occur before Adam's fall; etc.) it teaches that between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2 there was a divine judgment upon a pre-Adamite world. This results in a vast time gap between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2, sees the six creative days as days of reconstruction, and attempts thus to explain the earth's strata and fossils. Scofield, in his Reference Bible, leaves room for either the Literal Day-Literal Succession or the Age Day view to be combined with this hypothesis.¹⁴

(3) No Creation Prior to Day One

This theory fits the original creation of the universe including the heavens and the earth within the six days only. It denies that there was an immense time gap between Gen. 1:1 and 1:2 prior to Day One. It does this on the basis of believing that Exod. 20:11 teaches that everything was created during the six creation days. Opponents would say that the verb "made" (עָשָׂה, --asah) in Exod. 20:11 both includes arrangement of the matter created in Gen. 1:1 and all subsequent creative activities during the six days.

3. Theories Concerning the Length of the Six Creative Days

(1) Literal Day--Literal Succession Theory

This is the traditional view that the six creative days were of a 24-hour duration each, and that they followed one another in unbroken succession.

The geological and paleontological records are explained variously by (a) a Pro-chronic Creation (Philip Henry Gosse, 1857)¹⁵ which maintains that the earth was created with fossils and strata; (b) Flood Geology (Price, Nelson, Klotz, Zimmerman, Rehwinkel,

Morris, and Whitcomb) with the Flood as the major cause of fossil formations; (c) the Gap Theory, with geologic history before the six days.

It should be noted here that the dating of Archbishop Ussher (1581-1656) which placed the beginning of creation in the year 4004 B.C. is not an inherent part of this theory. In fact, the 4004 B.C. date has now generally been abandoned.

Also, some who hold the Literal Day--Literal Succession Theory join with others who hold opposing views, when it comes to the question, "How long ago was the first man created?" Many of these believe that the tables of Gen. 5 and 11 are genealogies which leave chronological gaps by intention (Warfield, Nelson, Allis, MacRae, Buswell, Jr., Buswell III, Whitcomb, etc.).

(2) Literal Day with Gaps Theory

This theory holds to literal creative days of 24 hours each, but it sees huge time gaps between each of the first six days. Among those who advocate this view is R. J. Duntzweiler of Faith Theological Seminary.¹⁶ This view preserves a 24-hour day "evening and morning" cycle while offering a time duration needed for a harmony with current scientific opinions.

(3) Age Day or Divine Day Theory

This theory, believing in Progressive Creation, takes the creative days to be long periods of time. Hugh Miller, James Dana, and J. W. Dawson are names associated with it. Many feel it to be the sought-for harmony between Genesis and Science. See Edwin Gedney's article, "Geology and the Bible," for an interesting harmony chart and a brief presentation of this view.¹⁷

The geological and paleontological records are explained by some in additional ways besides by harmonies between the Genesis days and the geologic ages. Cuvier explained them by successive catastrophes of water in addition to the flood of Genesis 6. He proposed a series of floods and catastrophes along with a series of creations.¹⁸ Likewise, Agassiz saw glaciation as the source of the catastrophes.¹⁹

(4) Pictorial Day Theory

Here the six days of Genesis 1 are taken as days during which God revealed the creation scenes to the prophet. They represent days in the life of the prophet who received the vision or the message, rather than time delineations during the original creative period. These days are also called "revelatory days." This view was adopted by J. H. Kurtz over a century ago, by Strong,²⁰ and is the view of Ramm today.²¹ This hypothesis attempts to harmonize Genesis and current scientific concensus by showing that Genesis is silent as to the time duration of creation, --the "days" having reference only to the prophet's visionary periods.

Exodus 20:11, which interprets the days as the creative periods during which God did His work rather than as days in the life of Moses, would certainly seem to challenge this theory! This is especially true in view of the fact that in Exodus 20:11 God Himself is the speaker!

Group Two: Theories Which Treat the Genesis Account As Non-Literal, Non-Inspired, or As Inaccurate in Details

(1) Moderate Concordism Theory

Ramm combines this with the previous theory, but actually they are separate ideas which may or may not be placed together. This theory beholds the Genesis narrative as being not strictly chronological, but topical and logical. It correlates the events in the account and the events in reality only in a general "moderate" chronological way. Ramm notes that S. R. Driver was of this persuasion!²² In other words, this view holds that the creation story tells topically, more than chronologically, what God created and arranged. Ramm holds this view himself.²³ The problem here, however, is that a "moderate concordance" implies a corresponding "moderate discordance!" When once such a dike is opened who can shut it?

(2) Religious Only Theory (Mythological or Allegorical Theory)

This view sees the creation account as a divine medium for putting forth certain religious truths. The narrative itself is not considered to be historically accurate; on the contrary, it is symbolical. Dr. Ralph Elliott's book, The Message of Genesis, recently advocated this ancient belief. Dr. Elliott takes Genesis 1-11 as non-historical and compares the creation account to Christ's parables.²⁴

The 105th San Francisco Southern Baptist Convention, June 1962, struggled over this work by Elliott, one of their professors in Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary. They finally rejected this work, which accepts the JEDP theory as fact,²⁵ by a two-to-one ratio vote.²⁶ Only two to one; how tragic!

This is certainly a view of unbelief! See Principle 12, supra, for a brief refutation of this view.

(3) Theistic Evolution Theory

This belief, which is advanced by many Roman Catholic theologians as well as by Protestant ones, accepts organic evolution as true, but it declares that God was the ultimate cause and guide of the evolutionary process. It is beset with all of the difficulties of the evolutionary hypothesis--paleontological gaps between the phyla, lack of a mechanism, etc.--but it offers a harmony between secular opinion and the Bible. This view would be combined with one or more of the others.

(4) Organic Evolution Theory

This theory, advocated by Darwin in 1859 in his Origin of the Species and champi-

oned by the eloquent Thomas Huxley, traces all present life forms through natural processes to an original ur slime's "fortuitous concourse of events." Its presuppositions are anti-supernaturalism and uniformitarianism. This view either interprets Gen. 1 as non-scientific and mythological or rejects it altogether as a "pious fraud."

Darwin's micro-evolution has, of course, today yielded to the macro-evolution (large jumps) theory. This latter theory, which was invented to avoid a supernatural alternative to the paleontologically disproved micro-evolution, requires great supernaturalistic faith to explain how the posited "jumps" from phyla to phyla took place!

(5) Local Creation Theory

John Pye Smith in 1840 wrote his belief that the harmony between Gen. 1 and geology resided in the understanding that the Genesis narrative describes a creation and remodeling of only a portion of near eastern territory with which the ancient Jewish world was familiar.²⁷ This may be compared to the similar local flood theory, but, however, the two are separate entities and stand or fall individually. Local creation, however, certainly falls!

CONCLUSION

Interpreters of this majestic narrative must ever keep before them the primary teaching of this wondrous account. In one of the most sublime passages known to the mind of man, and perhaps the sublimest, God here reveals His eternal existence before the universe, His omniscient and omnipotent creative power, and the stupendous fact that He, and He alone, called the worlds into being ex nihilo. He is seen as both the transcendent and immanent God of theism. He is seen as the holy Creator far above His creation; and yet as the one who cares for His own by providing signs for their seasons and herbs for their food. Here the first of man's three great questions is answered. "Whence is my origin?" is answered; "What is my present purpose?" and "What is my ultimate destiny?" can be partially solved by inference!²⁸ Here the grounds for God's claim upon every creature are laid. It came to pass graciously, miraculously, orderly, wisely, and perfectly. It was according to purpose and plan, blessed, and all very good. Special creation, not evolution, was its method; and its end was God's glory!

DOCUMENTATION

1. Jack W. Jacobs, Interpretation of New Testament Prophecy, Grace Theological Seminary, April 9, 1964. Valid here despite a slightly different context.
2. John Calvin, Genesis, I, 79 and 84.
3. Edwin K. Gedney, "Geology and the Bible," Modern Science and Christian Faith (Wheaton: Scripture Press, 1948), pp. 52-54.
4. Ralph H. Elliott, The Message of Genesis (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1961), p.33.
5. Gedney, pp. 56, 57, citing Augustine, De genesi ad litteram, Lib. i, Cap. xix, n. 39.
6. Ibid., p. 57, citing Aquinas, Summa Theologica, Pars Prima, Quaest, lxxviii, art. 1. It is to be realized that epistemological problems surround Aquinas' words, "turn out to be false."
7. John C. Whitcomb, Jr., Creatio Ex Nihilo: Creation Out of Nothing (unpublished compendium, n.d.), p. 2, citing Edward J. Young, Westminster Theological Journal, May 1959.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid., p. 1, citing J. Barton Payne, The Theology of the Older Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1962), p. 135.
12. Augustine, Confessions, 12:8.
13. C. I. Scofield, The Scofield Reference Bible (New York: Oxford University Press, 1909), pp. 3, 4.
14. Ibid., p. 4, footnotes 1 and 2.
15. Bernard Ramm, The Christian View of Science and Scripture (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1954), pp. 192-195. While not wishing to recommend many of Dr. Ramm's views, the author does recommend his book as an excellent encyclopedia on these topics.
16. Robert J. Dunzweiler, Systematic Theology class lecture, Faith Theological Seminary, Elkins Park, Pa., Feb. 9, 1960.
17. Gedney, pp. 23-57.
18. Ramm, pp. 188, 189.
19. Ibid.
20. Augustus H. Strong, Systematic Theology (Philadelphia: Judson Press, 1956), Vol. II, pp. 393-397.
21. Ramm, pp. 218-229.
22. Ibid., p. 221, footnote 66.
23. Ibid., pp. 218-229.
24. Elliott, p. 15.
25. Ibid.
26. Operation Unbelief (Collingswood: Twentieth Century Reformation Hour, n.d.), pp. 1, 2.
27. Ramm, pp. 190-192.
28. These three questions express the three ultimate inquiries to the mind of man according to Chandra Basu Rao, Instructor in Apologetics, Faith Theological Seminary, October 1958.

BIBLICAL NUMERICS

JOHN J. DAVIS

The general purpose of this study is to ascertain the nature and use of numbers in the Scriptures. More specifically, it will be concerned with the employment of symbolic numbers by the Biblical writers and the hermeneutical principles by which we are to interpret them. The general scope of Biblical numerics is of vital importance to any consideration of Biblical hermeneutics. From the first chapter of the Scriptures through the last, one is confronted with numbers in every type or style of writing. Therefore, anyone contemplating a serious study of the Scriptures and the principles by which one interprets them must commit himself to a serious study of numerics.

The scope of this study will include the nature of conventional numbers as well as that of symbolic numbers. Consideration will be given to: (1) the nature and use of conventional numbers, (2) the rhetorical use of numbers, (3) the symbolic use of numbers and (4) Gematria in Scripture and its place in Biblical Hermeneutics.

The vital problem concerned with the handling of numbers is not whether they are used symbolically and conventionally, but when they are so used. The destructive-critical approach generally places little value on numbers in the Old Testament. The general trend is to consider the greater bulk of them as symbolic or ideal.¹ A similar error is committed by some conservative scholars when they attempt to discover some hidden or deep spiritual mystery behind every occurrence of a number. It will be shown that these extremes, as well as others, must be avoided if a sound approach to Bible numerics is to be established. There is a definite place for the study of symbolic numbers, but without certain limits the study becomes a hermeneutical monstrosity and worthless in the quest for theological truth.

THE CONVENTIONAL USE OF NUMBERS

The conventional use of a number is that use which is concerned only with the mathematical value of the number. In contrast to this is the symbolic number which is used not only for its mathematical value but also for its theological significance. Before entering into the study of the specific uses of numbers, it would be well to examine briefly the syntax of numbers as they appear in the Bible.

I. The Construction of Numbers

Israel, like Assyria, Egypt, Greece, and Rome, used the decimal system of counting. The numbers found in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament are always written out. The same is true for the text of the New Testament with one exception.² This is the case with other Northwest Semitic writing prior to the exile. At Ugarit, the numerals in the literary texts

are always spelled out, except in the administrative documents where they are written ideographically with the Sumero-Akkadian symbols.

M. H. Pope points out that:

The Old Aramaic inscriptions from Zenjirli, the Aramaic documents from Elephantine,³ and some Phoenician inscriptions spell out numerals and also use figures.

He further notes that:

On the Aramaic lion weights from Nineveh (8th - 7th cent. B.C.) the numbers are doubly represented in words and figures.⁴

It appears that there is evidence that some peoples around Israel did use special signs for writing numbers, but there seems to be no evidence that the Hebrews employed such signs before the exile.⁵ On the basis of the present evidence, it appears that the Hebrews did not use a special sign for numbers until a rather late period. R. A. H. Gunner states the point as follows:

The idea of using letters of the alphabet for numerals originated from Greek influence or at least during the period of Greek influence, and, as far as is known, first appeared on Maccabean coins.⁶

After the exile, some of the Jews employed such signs as were used among the Egyptians, the Arameans, and the Phoenicians--an upright line for 1, two such lines for 2, three for 3, etc. and special lines for 10, 20, 100. At least as far back as the reign of the Maccabean Simon (143-135 B.C.), they numbered the chapters and verses and expressed dates by employing the consonants of the Hebrew alphabet: aleph for 1, beth for 2, etc. The letters of the Greek alphabet were used in the same way. This system, it must be emphasized, did not come into use until the post-exilic period. Numbers are spelled out on the Moabite stone (c. 835 B.C.) and the Siloam Inscription (c. 700 B.C.) and this is the case in all the Old Testament.

In the New Testament, numbers are also written out as they are in the Old, with one exception.⁷

II. The Use of Conventional Numbers

A. They are used in arithmetic. The following are some of the basic mathematical processes which employ numbers conventionally: (1) addition (Gen. 5:3-31; Num. 1:20-46), (2) subtraction (Gen. 18:28ff), (3) multiplication (Lev. 25:8; Num. 3:46ff), (4) division (Num. 31:27ff).

It is interesting to note that fractions were known and used in the Old Testament. Some examples are as follows: 1/2 (Ex. 25:10, 17), 1/3 (II Sam. 18:2), 1/4 (I Sam. 9:8), 1/5 (Gen. 47:24), 1/6 (Ezek. 46:14), 1/10 (Ex. 16:36), 2/10 (Lev. 23:13), 3/10 (Lev. 14:10),

1/100 (Neh. 5:11).

B. They are used in the basic, literal denotation of a quantity. Illustrations of this type are so numerous in the Scripture, it is not necessary to cite texts at this point. All are familiar with this "normal" use of numbers.

C. Higher numbers, which are conventional in use and literal in interpretation, are many times rounded and are not used for designating a large quantity in detail. For example, one hundred is used as a round number in Gen. 26:2; Lev. 26:8; II Sam. 24:3; Eccl. 8:12; Matt. 19:29; etc. A thousand is used in a similar way. This does not mean that the number is not to be understood literally, but it is a rounded number (cf. Ex. 20:6; Deut. 5:10; 7:9; I Sam. 18:7; Psa. 50:10; 90:4; 105:8; Isa. 60:22). Ten thousand is another case in point (Lev. 26:8; Deut. 32:30; Micah 6:7).

The highest number in the Bible described by a single word is 10,000. The highest numbers referred to in any way in the Bible are "a thousand thousand" (I Chron. 22:14; Rev. 5:11); "ten thousand times ten thousand" (Daniel 7:10; Rev. 5:11); and twice that figure (Rev. 9:16).

D. There are problems relative to the handling of conventional numbers. A number of problems are raised by the use of large numbers in the Old Testament. For example, the size of the exodus has been rejected because it is out of context for the Late Bronze Age (1500 B.C. - 1200 B.C.). If the numberings in Numbers 1 and 26 are correct, it appears that the children of Israel numbered about two and a half million. The critics are quick to point out that if this were the case, the Israelites would not have ^{desired} to enter Canaan which in the Late Bronze Age had a total population of about two or three million people.⁸ Critics object to this large number because that many people could not survive in the desert.

The solution offered to this problem by some scholars is to read 'eleph' not as "thousand" but as "family" or "tribe."⁹ By doing this, it is asserted, the totals would be from five to six thousand warriors. It is admitted that the term 'eleph' does have the idea of a family unit or tribe in some texts (e.g., Num. 1:16; 10:4), but the total given in Num. 2:32 raises a problem with this solution; namely, it assumes that 'eleph' means "a thousand." Other large numbers which have caused considerable difficulty to interpreters are the death of 50,070 male inhabitants of Beth-shemesh who were killed for irreverent treatment of the ark of God (I Sam. 6:19), the number of Jehoshaphat's army of 1,160,000 (II Chron. 18). II Kings 20:30 records that a wall fell and killed 27,000 people. More such large numbers could be enumerated but the foregoing should suffice to demonstrate that work is needed in these areas to clarify the use of these numbers.

Problems relative to conventional numbers are not only limited to large numbers, but to small numbers also. For example, the MT of II Sam. 24:13 gives the number of years of famine as seven, while the LXX and the parallel passage in I Chron. 21:12 give three.

The aim of this discussion is not to suggest solutions to all these problems, but to bring them to light. Each one of these considerations will in some way affect the handling of

numbers in every sphere of interpretation. Destructive critics, upon observing these large numbers, insist that they cannot be taken seriously, and from this point they attempt to discredit all numbers which cannot be harmonized with contemporary extra-biblical documents.

This problem, as well as others which have been discussed, should point out the absolute necessity for the interpreter having control of several disciplines in order to interpret the text accurately.

THE RHETORICAL USE OF NUMBERS

A very important use of numbers in the Old Testament is that for rhetorical or poetic effect. Whenever numbers are so used, they are not to be understood either literally or symbolically. Much time has been wasted in attempting to ascertain some hidden or mysterious meaning of a rhetorical phrase using numbers. The intention of the writer in this usage is not to emphasize the mathematical value of the number primarily, but to express either intensity or other concepts such as a "few."

There are, therefore, two basic applications of numbers in poetic structure.

I. The Climactic Use of Numbers

The arrangement of a numeral with its sequel within the same clause, either syndetically or asyndetically, is related to a similar rhetorical device in Northwest Semitic poetry in which consecutive numbers stand in synonymous parallelism. The intention of such a device is to express the concept of intensification and/or progression. The actual value of the number in such cases is not significant. Several examples of this use of numbers will illustrate this point. The numbers three and four are so used quite frequently in the Old Testament, but not in Ugaritic literature. The prophet Amos used such a device in Amos 1:9:

For three transgressions of Tyre, and for four, I will not turn away the punishment thereof.¹⁰

It is evident that the writer is not attempting to total the sins of Damascus, Gaza, etc. for the sins enumerated are in most cases neither three nor four. Another example is found in Proverbs 30:18:

There be three things which are too wonderful for me; yea, four which I know not. . . .

This phenomenon is common in Ugaritic literature as well as the Old Testament. The Baal Epic uses numerical climax to describe the attitude of the fertility god to sacrifice:

For two (kinds of) banquets Baal hates,
Three the Rider of the Clouds:
A banquet of shamefulness,
A banquet banquet of baseness,
And a banquet of handmaids' lewdness.
(Baal II, iii, 16-21)¹¹

After Baal was furnished with a temple, he made a journey to claim the domains which were rightly his. This description of his journey employs the use of climactic numbers.

Sixty-six towns he took,
 Seventy-seven hamlets;
 Eighty (took) Baal of (Zaphon's) s(ummit,)
 Ninety Baal of the sum(mit.)
 (Baal II, vii, 9-12)¹²

The numbers one thousand and ten thousand are used in this manner on a number of occasions in Ugaritic literature.¹³ Many different numbers are employed for climactic effect in Old Testament passages. The numbers one and two are quite common in the Old Testament, but are not so used in the Ugaritic texts (cf. Deut. 32:30; Job 33:14; 40:5; Jer. 3:14). Two numbers used climactically in both Scripture and Ugaritic texts are two and three (Hosea 6:2). Three and four are used in this manner also in Prov. 30:15, 18, 29 and in Amos 1:3-2:6. Five and six do not occur in parallelism either in the Old Testament or Ugaritic literature. Six and seven occur at least twice in the Old Testament, but not at all in Ugaritic texts (cf. Job 5:19; Prov. 6:16). The numbers seven and eight are used climactically in Micah 5:5 (Hebrew text, 5:4) and Eccl. 11:2.

II. The Rounded Use of Numbers

In the preceding discussion, the climactic use of numbers in poetic and rhetoric texts was considered. In the climactic use of numbers, the intensive or progressive idea was emphasized, in the "rounded" use of numbers the concept of fewness or greatness was the point of emphasis. For example, the number two by itself is used to designate the idea of fewness (Num. 9:22). In many cases the next higher number may be added to emphasize that the figure is only approximate. II Kings 9:32 provides us with an excellent example of this type of usage.

And he lifted up his face to the window, and said, Who is on my side? who?
 And there looked out to him two or three eunuchs.

The obvious intent of this expression is to convey the idea of a few. This is not unique for it is used in our everyday conversations. Other examples of this usage in the Bible are II Kings 13:19, Isa. 17:6, Amos 4:8, and Matt. 18:20.

This usage is paralleled in the Middle Assyrian Laws. In Law #24 we read that:

If a seignior's wife, having deserted her husband, has entered the house of an Assyrian, whether it was in the same city or in some neighboring city, where he set her up in a house, (and) she stayed with the mistress of the house (and) spent the night (there) three or four times, without the master of the house knowing that the seignior's wife was staying in his house....¹⁴

Other uses of numbers either syndetically or asyndetically for this purpose could be multi-

plied both in Scripture and other ancient texts.¹⁵ But the preceding discussion should demonstrate that, in the proper handling of numbers, the interpreter must first determine if the number is literal and has mathematical implications. Following this, it must be determined, if the case in point does not fit the literal usage, whether or not the number is used rhetorically. The general context will give the key to this. In poetic portions of Scripture, one should expect to find this phenomenon occurring with some frequency. If, by the process of elimination, the reason for the use of a number or numbers is still not clearly understood, symbolic implications of the number may be considered.

THE SYMBOLIC USE OF NUMBERS

A symbolic number is a number employed by a writer not only for its mathematical value, but for its theological significance. It should be pointed out that in most cases, if not in all, the numbers of Scripture are to be taken literally unless there is unquestionable proof that they are to be taken otherwise. The use of numbers symbolically is one of the more difficult aspects of the study of Biblical symbolism. It is difficult because of the mass of material involved. It is even the more difficult because of the methodology that must be employed to determine the nature and meaning of these symbols. The identification of symbolic numbers in Scripture, for the most part, must be the result of inductive research. Mickelsen states that: "Any symbolic meaning given to numbers must be based on inductive study."¹⁶ Terry suggests the same approach:

The only valid method of ascertaining the symbolical meaning and usage of such numbers, names, and colours in the Scriptures, is by an ample collation and study of the passages where they occur. The hermeneutical process is therefore essentially the same as that by which we ascertain the "usus loquendi" of words, and the province of hermeneutics is, not to furnish an elaborate discussion of the subject, but to exhibit the principles and methods by which such discussion should be carried out.¹⁷

But let it be noted at this point that this method need not be employed exclusively. This would have been the case one hundred years ago, but with the abundance of contemporary literature now translated and in print, one is able to compare literary forms. The science of philology has contributed considerably to a better understanding of Old Testament vocabulary and its literary devices. A careful reading of such contemporary literature, as for example the Ugaritic texts, will prove useful in the analyzation of symbolic numbers. This is not to say that the theological concepts of these texts must be paralleled with those of the Scripture, but helpful light can be shed on basic symbolic numbers which appear to be common to all Northwest Semitic languages. Extremes in this approach must be recognized. Cyrus Gordon recognized the fact that Ugaritic texts used numbers symbolically and rhetorically with considerable frequency, and in his effort to parallel Scripture with these texts, he has robbed Scripture of any real significant numerical reliability. The ages of men are constantly brought into question.¹⁸ Genealogies are reduced to schematic lists whose numbers one must not take seriously.¹⁹

Perhaps the easiest way to explain the method to be employed in ascertaining the meaning

and use of symbolic numbers is to illustrate the process. The best example of a symbolic number in Scripture is the number seven. We shall therefore examine this number in order to discover its symbolical meaning and usage. First, its occurrence in ancient Near Eastern literature as a symbolic number is significant. It occurs in many texts from widely separated geographic areas. It appears, therefore, that the symbolic use of the number was rather widespread and common in the Near East during the Old Testament period. The number seven:

. . . is found in reference to ritual in the age of Gudea, that is perhaps about the middle of the 3rd millennium B.C. "Seven gods" at the end of an enumeration meant "all the gods. . ." ²⁰

Smith further observes that:

There is clear evidence in cuneiform texts, which are our earliest authorities, that the Babylonians regarded seven as the number of totality, of completeness. The Sumerians, from whom the Semitic Babylonians seem to have borrowed the idea, equated seven with "all." The seven-storied towers of Babylonia represent the universe. ²¹

The number seven in Scripture occurs in one way or another in nearly 600 passages in the Bible. When all the uses of this number are collected and studied they can be divided into four main categories.

I. The Historic Use of Seven

The number seven occurs many times in historic contexts or narratives. It is apparent that in many of these occurrences there are symbolic implications along with the literal meaning of the number. The following texts are examples of the use of seven in historical narratives: Jacob's 7 years' service for Rachel (Gen. 29:20f), Jacob's bowing down 7 times to Esau (Gen. 33:3), 7 years of plenty and 7 years of famine (Gen. 41:53), Samson's 7 day marriage feast (Judges 14:12 cf. Gen. 29:27), etc. The above numbers must, no doubt, be understood literally in most cases. But even when these numbers are interpreted literally, one is impressed by the fact that frequent occurrences of this number seem to indicate a symbolic usage also.

II. The Ritualistic Use of Seven

A careful reading of the commands and history of sacrifices, feasts, etc. will evidence a frequent occurrence of the number seven. Once again these are to be understood literally, but with symbolic implications. The following examples will illustrate this particular use of the number seven: The 7 days of unleavened bread (Ex. 34:18, etc.), 7 days of the Feast of Tabernacles (Lev. 23:34), the 7th year was the sabbatical year (Ex. 21:2, etc.), the Moabite Balak built for Balaam on three occasions 7 altars and provided in each case 7 bullocks and 7 rams (Num. 23:1, 14, 29), etc.

III. The Didactic or Literary Use of Seven

The symbolic use of seven naturally led to its employment by poets and teachers for the vivid expression of many, multitude, or intensity. This particular use of the number is sometimes very evident and other times latent. The following are some examples of this use: the 7-fold curse predicted for the murderer of Cain (Gen. 4:15), fleeing 7 days (Deut. 28:7, 25), praise of God 7 times a day (Psa. 119:164), etc.

IV. The Apocalyptic Use of Seven

The appearance of the number in the book of Revelation is so common that extensive commentary is not needed at this point. This use of seven, as in the other uses, is best understood literally with symbolic intentions. For example, in Rev. 1:4 there is mention of the "seven churches in Asia." There is no doubt as to the literal nature of this number for seven churches did indeed exist in Asia at that time. But the fact that there were more than seven in Asia at that time indicates that the writer is using the number symbolically or ideally. Hieropolis and Colossae were both located in the province of Asia (Col. 1:2; 4:13, 15, 16) but are not dealt with in Revelation. Other occurrences of the number seven in Revelation are as follows: 1:12 (candlesticks); 1:16 (stars); 1:20 (angels); 4:5 (lamps); 1:4, 3:1, 4:5 (spirits); 5:1 (seals); also, 5:6; 8:2; 10:3; 12:3; 13:1; 15:1, 7; 17:3, 9, 10.

It appears that in some cases there is an attempt to use the multiples of seven in a symbolic sense also. The following are possible examples: fourteen (2×7)--Ex. 12:6, 16; Num. 29:13, 15, etc.; forty-nine (7×7)--Lev. 23:15ff; 25:8ff; and seventy (7×10). Multiples of seven are employed respecting: persons (Ex. 1:5; Deut. 10:22; Ex. 24:1, 9); periods (Gen. 50:3; Isa. 23:15, 17; Jer. 25:11; and objects or animals (Ex. 15:27; Num. 33:9; II Chron. 29:32).

On the basis of these many occurrences, and on the basis of the usage of seven in extra-Biblical texts, it is generally agreed that the number seven when used symbolically designates the idea of completeness, or perfection. The above discussion is designed to illustrate the methodology of determining the meaning of a symbolic number. The analysis of this number is quite easy because of its frequent use, but other numbers are not so easy to analyze. There appears to be general agreement among interpreters that the numbers 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 12 and 40 are used symbolically in Scripture. Because of the lack of space, a detailed consideration of these numbers cannot be given at this point.

THE THEORY OF MYSTICAL NUMERICS

The theory of mystical numerics is that system of interpretation which endeavors to seek out hidden truths by means of numerical phenomena. According to this system of interpretation, all that God does He does with perfection and precision. His works are "absolutely perfect in every particular."²² All His works are perfect in power, holiness, design, execution, object, end, and perfect in number.²³ According to this theory, the perfection of God's handiwork is in evidence in both His works and His words.²⁴ If one is really to appre-

ciate the world about him, he must seek out the grand mysteries of nature as they are revealed in numeric design. So it is with the Word of God. It too has a perfect numeric pattern running through every chapter and for every Bible student who seeks out this pattern and analyzes it, there awaits a deep spiritual blessing. A careful study of these numeric patterns, according to this theory, will give the student insights into the Scriptures which he could get in no other way.

According to the advocates of this system, the student must be aware of two basic principles regarding numbers and the Bible. First, he must recognize that there is design in the use of numbers in the Scripture. Secondly, the student must recognize the significance of the numbers after the basic design has been established.

Who are the chief advocates of this complicated exposition of the deep mysteries? This system of hermeneutics has a long history. Aristobulus the philosopher interpreted the number seven mystically, and Philo followed suit, elaborating the hidden wonders of the number in considerable detail. The Talmudic, Midrashic, and Cabalistic literature developed and used for the interpretation of the Scriptures a sort of numerology called Gematria, a Hebraized form of geômetria which sought to discover the hidden sense of the Hebrew text through the numerical values of the letters of the alphabet. This method was recognized as the 29th of the 32 hermeneutical rules of Rabbi Eliezer ben Jose. In more modern times this type of interpretation has been propagated by Dr. Milo Mahan of New York in his work "Palomoni."²⁵ Perhaps the most detailed and extensive writings in this area have come from the pen of Ivan Panin, a Russian by birth and later a graduate of Harvard University. His works appeared in the early 20th century. Contemporary with Panin in this venture was the well known E. W. Bullinger of Great Britain.²⁶

It will be our purpose in this section to examine the claimed values of this system of interpretation and the principles on which it operates. Having done this, an evaluation of the system will be given.

The Claimed Values of this System

I. Bible Numerics Help Prove Inspiration

From the pen of Ivan Panin we have the following:

The present writer's labours in the field of numerics have been numerous and arduous, but they have been desultory; the reason being that he desired first of all to establish before the candid reader the fact that the unique, and on purely human grounds inexplicable, numeric structure of Scripture establishes its being the writing not of the human mind, but of a superhuman mind.²⁷

II. Bible Numerics Secures the Perfect Text of the Bible

Now, however, a perfect text can be obtained. The key of "Bible Numerics"

detects at once the true. . .²⁸

III. It Solves the Problems of the Authorship of Bible Books

Numerics solve the problem of New Testament authorship as here presented; and every one of the 33 Bible writers can be demonstrated as surely as those eight New Testament writers to be presented in our next paper.²⁹

IV. It Provides Deep Insight into the Mysteries of the Bible ³⁰

We will not comment on these claims at this point, but will first consider the methodology of this system and then evaluate the system and its claims in the final portion of this section. The principles of operation of this system fall into two general classes or methods.

The Methodology

I. The Open Numeric Phenomena

The open numeric phenomena are the data of the Biblical text which exhibit a numeric structure which is plain and incontestable. This design of Scripture is sought out by two methods.

A. The numeric analysis of verses and sentences. The best way to explain this method is to observe it in operation. The numeric analysis of sentences and verses consists of a counting of: (1) the number of letters in the verse, (2) the number of words in the sentence, and (3) the totaled number of significant words. This is illustrated clearly by a portion of Panin's treatment of Genesis 1:1:

The number of words in this verse in the Hebrew, in which language the Old Testament is written, is seven. (Feature 1.) These seven words have fourteen syllables, or 2 sevens (Feature 2) and 28 letters, or 4 sevens (Feature 3). The 28 letters of these seven words are thus divided: the first three words constituting the subject and predicate of the sentence - "In the beginning God created" -- have 14 letters, or 2 sevens; the last four words, constituting the object of the sentence -- "the heavens and the earth" - have also 14 letters (Feature 4), etc.³¹

It will be seen that the emphasis is upon the occurrence of the number seven and its multiples which, it is implied, demonstrates that the text has been perfectly preserved. But is this to say that verse two has not been transmitted accurately? Allis submits the following observation:

If the fact that verse 1 is a perfect example of 7's appearing in both words and letter means that its text has been perfectly preserved, are we to infer that verse 2 has been imperfectly transmitted to us because it has 52 letters? Or does this verse have a different numeric structure?³²

It will be seen that this type of objection may be raised in the handling of all verses in this manner. Granted that special numerical phenomena have been discovered in certain verses, does this make them more inspired than those which do not exhibit such mathematical niceties?

B. The numeric analysis of words, names and grammatical forms. More numeric data are compiled by these men by counting certain words and names as they occur in the Scripture. Such lists include the number of times such words as "covenant," "grace," "holy," "blood," etc. occur. Personal names such as Jesus, Moses, Paul, etc., are counted and analyzed.³³ The idea behind this approach is that in Scripture all names, words, etc. that are really important will exhibit numeric patterns, usually with the number seven as its basis. Bullinger has this to say regarding this method:

The actual number (of occurrences of certain words) depends upon the special significance of the word; for the significance of the word corresponds with the significance of the number of the times it occurs. Where there is no special significance in the meaning or use of the word, there is no special significance in the number of its occurrences.³⁴

But this assumption of Bullinger must at once be brought into question. Does numerical pattern demonstrate the importance or nonimportance of a name or word? For example it has been shown that the name of Moses occurs 847 times (7×121) in the Bible. This is a fact which all writers of this school have brought to our attention. But Allis objects to this method and with good reason. He points out that the name of Aaron appears 346 times in the Old Testament and 5 times in the New Testament for a total of 351 occurrences. He observes further that:

351 is one more than 350 (7×50). 346 is three more than 343 ($7 \times 7 \times 7$). 5 is two less than 7. Is there something wrong with the occurrences of this name? Or was Aaron relatively unimportant?³⁵

It should be rather obvious that this particular method of numerics rests on a faulty premise and no amount of argument will overcome the weight of evidence against it.

C. The numeric analysis of "vocabulary" words. Beside counting words, phrases, names, and certain grammatical forms, the advocates spend great time in establishing a "vocabulary" which exhibits numeric patterns. What is a vocabulary word? How is it to be determined? Ivan Panin explains this system as follows:

The form in which a word occurs is not necessarily the same as the vocabulary word. Thus "I struck him" has for its vocabulary "I, strike, he;" while the forms in which the words "strike" and "he" occur here are: "struck, him." A vocabulary of forms is thus hardly ever the same as the simple vocabulary.³⁶

Thus, the advocates of mysterious numerics extend their system farther and farther. Along with the establishment of the "vocabulary" words, the various forms of these words are calculated also (e.g. nominative, genitive, accusative cases).

The real fallacies in this system of interpretation become evident when one examines the methods of calculation. In many cases, vital portions of Scripture do not exhibit any observable numeric phenomena. In this case an appeal is made to "neighboring numbers." If a word or sentence produces a number which is only one digit from a multiple of seven, this is as good as if it were that number. In other words, a miss is not as good as a mile! A small miss is as good as a hit! It should be evident that such methodology has no place in a serious consideration of Biblical hermeneutics. This assertion will be further justified when the second major principle of operation is considered.

II. The Gematria or Mystical Numeric Phenomena

As previously pointed out, Gematria is that system of interpretation which seeks to discover the hidden sense of the Hebrew and Greek text through the numerical values of the letters of the alphabet. William Taylor Smith defines this approach as follows:

. . . the use of the letters of a word so as by means of their combined numerical value to express a name, or witty association of ideas.³⁷

It is argued that both the Greek and Hebrew alphabets have numerical values attached to their letters. And this is true. In the post-exilic period the Hebrews apparently did use their letters numerically on occasions, but it is not true that the Bible writers employed this method.

The best way to understand this method of interpretation is to see it at work. And for that we call the reader's attention to another portion of Panin's discussion of Genesis 1:1:

The numeric value of the first word of this verse is 913; of the last 296; of the middle, the fourth word, 401; the numeric value of the first, middle and last words is thus 1610, or 230 sevens (Feature 7); the numeric value of the first, middle, and last letters of the 28 letters of this verse is 133, or 19 sevens. (Feature 8.)

If now the first and last letters of each of the seven words in this verse have their numeric value placed against them, we have for their numeric value 1393, or 199 sevens. (Feature 9.) Of these, the first and last words have 497 or 71 sevens; and the remaining five words have 896, or 128 sevens. (Feature 10.)³⁸

Notice carefully the method by which these "features" are determined.³⁹ It can be seen that there is no end to which these men will go in their search for numeric phenomena. But they are not even satisfied with this. We have yet to discuss the "place value" of a number. Ivan

Panin reminds us that:

The place value of a letter as distinguished from its numeric value is the number of its place in the alphabet. Thus alpha being the first letter of the alphabet, its place value is 1; of beta 2; of gamma 3; . . . ⁴⁰

In other words we have a grand new horizon before us in which we may unlock even more mysteries of the Bible!

An Evaluation of this System

Without observing this methodology any further, let us pause amidst this mass of numbers and facts to evaluate the total system. It appears to this writer, from a consideration of all the claims of this system, that there must be total rejection of this approach to Biblical interpretation. The following are the reasons for this conclusion.

First, this system is based on a false apologetic: namely, if this wonderful numerical pattern can be established, the world will no longer be able to reject the Bible as uninspired. It is claimed that there is numeric precision in nature so there must be in the Word of God. But we should like to ask, what is all this to a blind man? What man has ever beheld the holiness of Christ in the numeric patterns of nature and was saved? If human depravity is all that the Scriptures describe it to be, no amount of numeric evidence will rationalize the sinner into salvation. Only the Spirit of God can make an individual aware of his condition before God.

Second, this system can be applied to any numbers. Allis has illustrated this point well with the number 1776, the year of the Declaration of Independence. It has two sevens in it. Add the first and last numbers together and you have another seven, etc. ⁴¹

Third, there is no objective basis for controlling this methodology. The interpreter selects his own words, and the combinations of numbers that he wishes. In other words, the number 7 might have several combinations (6 + 1, 5 + 2, 4 + 3). How do we know which of these combinations the author intended to bear symbolic implications?

Fourth, the appeal to "neighboring numbers" is not only a mathematical absurdity, but renders the symbolism of numbers meaningless.

Fifth, this whole system is based on a false premise. There is no proof that the Hebrews of the Old Testament used their alphabet in this manner (i.e. in Gematria). As was pointed out earlier, the Moabite Stone and the Siloam Inscription have their numbers written out. This is the case in all the Old Testament. If we grant, for example, that the Greeks did use their alphabet in this manner, it has yet to be proven that these two factors are combined in Scripture. As far as can be determined, there is only one example of Gematria in the Bible, namely, Rev. 13:18 (TR). The Greek letters chi, xi, sigma undoubtedly have reference to numerical value which totals 666. The interpretations of this number have been many and varied.

Nero has been a favorite candidate for identification of this personage in Revelation, since his name in Hebrew totals up to 666. One evangelist totaled up the values of the name Harry S. Truman and was sure he was the anti-Christ because he came up with 666! All kinds of theories and interpretations have been based on these three Greek letters, all of which have numerical support. This should make the interpreter aware of the fact that such attempts to uncover "Bible mysteries" is a waste of time.

Another example of the absurd conclusion that one might draw from numerics is found in Numbers 12:1. "The Cushite" has the numerical value of 735 which is the same as the value of "good looking" in Gen. 12:11. The conclusion would be that Moses' wife was a beautiful woman!

Sixth, this system of interpretation contributes nothing to a better understanding of the text. If anything, it complicates the simplicity of the Word of God. Any system of interpretation which operates on subjective notions is a scheme, not a system, and has no real place in Biblical hermeneutics.

CONCLUSION

The study of Biblical numbers can be a very rewarding and satisfying venture provided it is done within the limits of sound hermeneutics. Any attempt to construct an elaborate system of interpretation based solely on the occurrence or non-occurrence of certain numbers can be very dangerous. There is a definite place for the study of the use of symbolic numbers and their theological implications. But the interpreter must beware that he be not carried away with this approach and lose sight of the all important literal uses of numbers. In this age of semantic and theological confusion, let us who handle the Word of God do so with power and simplicity, both of which are results of the Spirit's leadership.

DOCUMENTATION

1. Cyrus H. Gordon, The World of the Old Testament. (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1958) p. 117, note 7.
2. Rev. 13:18. This text will be discussed at a later point.
3. M. H. Pope, "Number." The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962) p. 563.
4. Ibid.
5. William Taylor Smith, "Numbers." The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. (Chicago: The Howard-Severance Co. 1925) IV, p. 2157.
6. R. A. H. Gunner "Numbers." The New Bible Dictionary. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1962) p. 895.
7. Rev. 13:18. For a detailed discussion of the syntax of Greek numbers see A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. (New York: Hodder & Stroughton, 1915) p. 281 ff.

8. R. A. H. Gunner, op. cit., p. 896. (cf. also The Journal of Biblical Literature, March 1958).
9. Ibid.
10. Compare also Amos 1:3, 6, 9, 11, 13; 2:1, 4, 6.
11. James B. Pritchard. (ed.) Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955) p. 132.
12. Ibid., p. 134.
13. Ibid., p. 135 (Baal II, viii, 24); p. 136 (Baal VAB, A, 13, 14); p. 138 (Baal VAB, F, 1, 2 11).
14. Ibid., p. 182. (underlining mine)
15. Compare also Amarna Letter #29:17, 20.
16. A. Berkeley Mickelsen. Interpreting the Bible. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1963) p. 272.
17. Milton S. Terry. Biblical Hermeneutics. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, n.d.) p. 380.
18. Cyrus H. Gordon. The World of the Old Testament. (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1958) pp. 140, 141.
19. Ibid., pp. 116, 117.
20. William Taylor Smith, op. cit., p. 2159. The date for Gudea is more accurately the late third Millennium or early second Millennium. Recent trends have tended to lower all dates for this period.
21. Ibid.
22. E. W. Bullinger. Number in Scripture. (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode Ltd., 1913) p. 1.
23. Ibid.
24. Ibid., p. 2.
25. This work has long been out of print and knowledge of this work comes from the preface to Bullinger's work on numbers. Op. Cit., p. vi.
26. A host of others might be listed here, but those named appear to be the leaders of this school of interpretation.
27. Ivan Panin. "Bible Numerics." Things To Come. (London: Horace Marshall & Son, Feb. 1912) Vol. XVIII, No. 12, p. 21. See also Bullinger, op. cit., p. 20.
28. Ibid., Vol. XVII, No. 1, (1911) p. 2.
29. Ibid., Vol. XIX, No. 1, (1913) p. 7.
30. E. W. Bullinger, op. cit., p. 20ff.
31. Ivan Panin, op. cit., Vol. XVII, No. 12, (Dec. 1911) pp. 140-141.
32. Oswald T. Allis. Bible Numerics. (Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1961) p. 7.
33. Ivan Panin, op. cit., Vol. XIX, No. 4 (1913) p. 44f. cf. also Ibid. no. 3, p. 30f.
34. E. W. Bullinger, op. cit., pp. 22, 23, (parenthesis mine)
35. Oswald T. Allis, op. cit., pp. 8, 9.
36. Ivan Panin, op. cit., Vol. XVII, No. 1 (1911) p. 8, #5.
37. William Taylor Smith, op. cit., p. 2162.
38. Ivan Panin, op. cit., Vol. XVII, No. 12, (Dec. 1911) pp. 140-141.
39. Ivan Panin, op. cit., Vol. XVII, No. 7, (July, 1911) pp. 82-83.
40. Ivan Panin, op. cit., Vol. XVII, No. 1, (1911) p. 8, #4.
41. See Allis, op. cit., pp. 3, 4 for a complete illustration of this point. Also cf. p. 24.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Bruce Manning Metzger. Oxford University Press, New York and London, 1964. 268 pp., \$7.00.

As the subtitle indicates this volume deals with the transmission, the corruption, and the restoration of the text of the New Testament in the original Greek language. The manuscript was finished in August of 1963 and published early in 1964. At this date it constitutes the latest contribution to this important area of New Testament study. The main discussion, the footnotes, the appendices, and the bibliography indicate that the author had access to a wide variety of sources, and with the skill of a careful scholar used them in the preparation of this treatise.

In broad lines of development this book brings into perspective the entire field of textual criticism, utilizing the latest information available from archeological finds and scholarly exploration of the materials. Though the writer is not attempting to be exhaustive in treatment, with the skill of one who is thoroughly acquainted with the field, he surveys intensively, and almost microscopically at times, the materials for study, the history of textual criticism, and the application of principles to the New Testament text.

In the estimation of the reviewer, the writer, Dr. Metzger, Professor of New Testament Language and Literature in Princeton Theological Seminary, presents with remarkable clarity a most difficult and abstruse subject for the average theological student of the New Testament. He does this with remarkable aloofness from theological bias. The application of the entire discipline to strategic portions of the New Testament

text where variations appear demonstrates the value of the study and serves as a fitting climax to the discussion.

HERMAN A. HOYT
Grace Theological Seminary

INTRODUCTION TO NEW TESTAMENT TEXTUAL CRITICISM. By J. Harold Greenlee. William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co. 160 pp., \$3.50.

The first element considered in determining the value of this book was whether the author accomplished his professed purpose. In the preface (p. 7) Dr. Greenlee explains that

This book is a primer. It does not seek to make a contribution to the knowledge of those who are already scholars of New Testament textual criticism. The aim of this book is simply to present facts and principles of New Testament textual criticism that are generally accepted.

Dr. Greenlee has done just that. The whole volume is clearly set forth. He defines technical textual critical terms in such a manner that a beginner could understand the principles involved. He has outlined the material covered in such a way that too many confusing facts are not presented at the same time, thus avoiding possible misunderstandings. He progressively adds to the basic facts in a concise logical sequence in order to establish an over-all picture of what is included in New Testament textual criticism.

The book begins with a general introduction to New Testament textual criticism and its purpose. This is followed by chapters

on palaeography, sources and transmission of the New Testament text, the history of the text in print, and the development of a critical text. The whole book builds toward chapters seven through nine where the previously stated material is put to practical use in learning how to read the critical apparatus, solve textual problems, and collate and classify manuscripts.

The figures and plates are few in number each being of definite didactic value. The chart (pp. 117, 118) on the various text types and the witnesses for each of them in the several sections of the New Testament is a good summary for the beginner's reference. Figure 4 on page 32 depicts in graphic resume the palaeographic background of the Greek New Testament manuscripts. His examples of textual variations, errors, and problems are to the point and well chosen. At the end of the book there is an appendix containing some commonly used Latin terms and their meanings. This would be of value to those whose knowledge of Latin is limited. There follows a list of supplementary readings for each chapter of the book which with the selected bibliography would be very helpful to those desiring to pursue this study further. The indexes of persons and subjects, of Scripture references, and of Greek terms seem to be adequate.

This book can be evaluated as a scholarly but brief, easy to understand, up-to-date primer on the introduction to New Testament textual criticism. It cannot overshadow or replace Frederic G. Kenyon's Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament which, though not up-to-date and harder to read, is far more detailed in its discussion of the manuscripts of the New Testament and the whole subject of New Testament textual criticism in general. Dr. Greenlee does not purport his book to be any more than a primer and in no sense a refer-

ence or a handbook as is Kenyon's volume.

Perhaps a book given to discussing copyist's errors cannot hope to avoid containing a few of its own. On page twenty-six, the fifteenth line from the bottom, "God" is a misprint for "Cod." Also on page eighty-seven, eleven lines down, "and" was printed "annd." Several places in the book the print was faded enough to make the reading uncertain at first glance, especially the symbols near the bottom of page thirty-one.

DWIGHT E. ACOMB

Winona Lake, Indiana

GREEK-ENGLISH ANALYTICAL CONCORDANCE OF THE GREEK-ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT. By J. Stegenga. Hellenes-English Biblical Foundation, Jackson, Miss., 1963. Distributed by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 832 pp., \$14.95.

The compiler of this massive work is a layman who has devoted the last ten years, full time, to its preparation. The dust jacket states that he retired from an active business career to devote his life to this project. During some of this time he lived in Greece, Cyprus, Patmos and other New Testament locations. The Introduction claims that 36,600 hours were required for the task.

Stegenga's Concordance places a wealth of material in the hands of the student, and enables him to save hours of valuable research time in the mechanics of lexical study. The plan of the work in brief is as follows: Greek words are listed in alphabetical order. In the case of compound words, cross references are used, and the words are treated under the root origins.

In the treatment of each word, an analysis is given of each form used in the New Testament, together with a listing of every

occurrence of the form, and the English translation (KJV). For instance, the word abusson appears alphabetically under "A," but the student is referred to the root buthos. Here he finds that abusson appears in the accusative singular in three places and in the genitive singular in six places. The Scripture references are listed.

This concordance is especially helpful when one is studying verb uses and the significance of tenses. All the references of a certain verb used in a given tense are grouped, so that the researcher is spared many hours of toil.

The Greek text of Stephanus 1550 (also Elzevir 1624) is used as the basis. Although this choice of text is not without some problems for users of Westcott and Hort or Nestle, it is perhaps a practical procedure, inasmuch as the Textus Receptus on the whole is characterized by greater fullness, and includes most of the text found in the more recent critical editions. However, in those places where significant variants are adopted in these new editions, it would have been helpful had the compiler taken some notice of them.

Serious Bible students will be using this concordance with profit for many years.

HOMER A. KENT, JR.
Grace Theological Seminary

THE VALIDITY OF THE VIRGIN BIRTH. By Howard A. Hanke. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1963. 114 pp., \$2.50.

Dr. Hanke, professor of Bible at Asbury College and an ordained minister in the Rocky Mountain Conference of The Methodist Church, has written a very clear presentation of the importance of holding to the doc-

trine of the Virgin Birth. The first half of the book consists of the testimony of many witnesses from the Old Testament, New Testament and Church Fathers. He clearly points out the basis of dissent by liberals upon "arbitrary philosophical considerations." There is definite warning against the philosophies of so-called scholars who promote skepticism under the guise of Biblical criticism in "church school literature" today. The only place in the book where the presentation seems to be somewhat vague is in regard to Isaiah 7:14. This reviewer feels that there could have been a stronger emphasis of the context.

In the second portion of the book, Dr. Hanke shows the real importance of the doctrine of the virgin birth in relation to other doctrines. Doctrines treated as dependent upon the virgin birth are the Deity, Lordship, Saviourhood, Bodily Resurrection and Second Coming of Jesus Christ, the New Birth of the Believer, and the Son Relationship of Jesus to God the Father.

The lengthy conclusion goes to the foundations to answer the question of why the virgin birth is rejected by those who accept evolution. The arguments are very clearly written and the issue is made clear: "that spiritual perception is possible only for the spiritually initiated." "Those who have experienced the miracle of the 'new birth' have no problem with the virgin birth of Jesus Christ." The necessity of the new birth is clearly presented which ought to make this book valuable for use with those who think themselves intellectual. Dr. Hanke does not claim to prove the virgin birth but very skillfully proves his thesis, that this doctrine is valid and must be received by faith. He says ". . . it is doubtful if proof can be adduced that will convince others (than Christians). Those washed in the blood of the Lamb believe that the virgin birth 'is in-

dispensable for Christian faith and Christian living.'"

The author has used The Genesis Flood by Henry M. Morris and John C. Whitcomb, Jr. quite extensively for support to show the incompatible relationship of evolution with the doctrine of the virgin birth. This book is very valuable for use in anyone's ministry whether professor, pastor, or layman.

ALVA F. GOOSSEN

Berean Bible Church
Wichita, Kansas

PROPHETS IN PERSPECTIVE. By B. D. Napier. Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1963. 128 pp., \$2.75.

Prophets in Perspective is a revision and enlargement of Napier's article on "Prophet and Prophetism" in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. It is a more important work than its brevity might suggest, since it summarizes and popularizes much of the critical work done on the subject in recent years.

The author has accepted many of the destructive conclusions of the form-criticism school of thought, but has exhibited some reserve in rejecting the extreme positions of some European scholars. For example, while rejecting the older anti-cult, anti-institutional view of the prophetic movement, he also rejects the more current "cultic-institutional" interpretation. None-the-less, he sketches with apparent approval Begrich's application to prophetic literature

of his earlier form-criticism of the lamentation Psalms. Such a treatment of the prophets implies contact with the cultus.

Napier also endeavors to take a mediating view in the matter of oral tradition vs. writing prophets. The results are far from satisfactory to one holding the orthodox doctrine of scripture. Likewise objectionable on the same grounds is the form-critical distinction in the prophetic utterances between the "speech of invective" (Scheltrede) and the "word of judgment" (Drohwort). The treatment implies a short oracle received by revelation from the LORD, accompanied by a longer interpretive speech worked out by the prophet. Other objections of a similar nature could be cited.

There are a number of valuable contributions on the positive side. One of them is the insistence on a core of the prophetic tradition existing from the beginning of Israelite history. Another is the presentation of the prophetic concept of the dynamic, instrumental quality of the Word. Perhaps the best chapter of the book is the last, which expounds a number of the themes in the faith of classical prophetism.

Read with discrimination, Prophets in Perspective can be quite helpful. One little slip in the treatment of Hebrew grammar appears on p. 15. The word pi'el should be replaced by niph'al.

S. HERBERT BESS
Grace Theological Seminary

